

THE
TÂITTIRÎYA-PRÂTIÇÂKHYA,
WITH ITS COMMENTARY,
THE TRIBHÂSHYARATNA:
TEXT, TRANSLATION, AND NOTES.

BY
WILLIAM D WHITNEY,
PROFESSOR OF SANSKRIT IN YALE COLLEGE.

[FROM THE JOURNAL OF THE AMERICAN ORIENTAL SOCIETY, VOL IX, 1871.]

NEW HAVEN
FOR THE AMERICAN ORIENTAL SOCIETY,
PRINTED BY TUTTLE, MORSEHOUSE AND TAYLOR, PRINTERS TO YALE COLLEGE
MDCCLXXI
SOLD BY THE SOCIETY'S AGENTS
NEW YORK B WESTERMANN & CO, 471 BROADWAY,
LONDON TRÜBNER & CO, AND WILLIAMS & NORGATE,
LEIPZIG F A BROCKHAUS.

THE TÂITTIRÎYA-PRÂTIÇÂKHYA,

WITH ITS COMMENTARY,

THE TRIBHÂSHYARATNA

INTRODUCTORY NOTE

THE manuscript material on which is founded this edition of the Tâittirîya-Prâtiçâkhyâ and Tribhâshyaratna is as follows

1 T A copy of the text of the treatise alone, in a modern hand, on light-colored paper. It was sent me by Prof Fitz Edward Hall, from Benares, in 1857, and appears to be a copy made for him from some older manuscript but it contains no intimation of its own date or of that of its original, presenting at the end, in place of the usual colophon, the beginning of a list of words which in *pâda*-text show a final " It is distinctly and correctly written. On the back is inscribed "Kriṣṇa-yajuh-prâtisâkhyâ, by Kârtikeya" On what ground this ascription of authorship is made, I do not know, it does not, so far as I am aware, find support from any other quarter

2 W A copy of the text and commentary together, each separate rule being followed by its own comment. This manuscript, like the preceding, I owe to the kindness of Prof Hall. It is handsomely written, in a large clear hand, and fills 146 leaves (numbered 1-89, 100, 1-56), measuring about four and a half by nine and a half inches. To the end of 25a, seven lines are written on a page, thenceforward, nine lines. It has no statement of scribe, place, or date, but I imagine that a final leaf, with the end of the colophon, had been lost or destroyed some time before it was sent to me. The part remaining reads as follows *grîkṛshnârpabhastu grîkâlabhâdâranaprasannam om yâgyakâmdauvidhâdyordhvam rshayo 1shayo rshik ity âçtsiâçinmakâpânvam rsham ce ti 3 utam-tratâ 1 kânyâdhvâno bhavaty agre pânako rpayatîti ca* This just fills up the leaf, but another hand has written below, at its edge, what purports to be the ending of the second verse *ishâ-*

yemqura ity erāpy agā ity ādī lupyate 2, and has added, as final benediction, *grāhiteṣvānuprasann*

This is a virgin manuscript, containing neither erasures, insertions, nor alterations. Considering that it thus presents every first fault of its scribe unamended, it is very good and correct. Through the first twelve chapters, the rules of the *Pratīcākhya* are distinguished from the commentary by being rubbed over with a red powder.

3 **B** This authority comes from the west of India, where (see Dr Buhler, in *Zeitsch Deut Moig Ges*, xlii 319) the *Tribhāṣa-yaratna* is said to be not very rare. From a manuscript there collected, a copy was made under direction of Dr Buhler for the Berlin library, and forwarded to Prof Weber, at whose friendly suggestion and instance it was transcribed for me, in roman letters, by Dr Siegfried Goldschmidt, to whom I desire here to express my gratitude for a service so valuable and so kindly rendered. The manuscript contains more inaccuracies of reading than any of the others which I have used, yet they are in the main superficial, and the text given is a pretty complete and correct one.

4 **O** Through the kind offices of Prof Max Muller, I have been enabled to procure a collation (made with a copy of my own manuscript, "W") of the incomplete Oxford manuscript (MS Bodl W 478), first described by Roth (*Zur Lit und Gesch des Weda*, pp 54, 62 seq), and used also by Weber (*Ind Stud* iv 77 seq). It begins in the middle of the comment upon iii 12, thus lacking somewhat less than a quarter of the entire work.

5 **G** This is a romanized copy of a manuscript which belongs to the Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain and Ireland, and is written on strips of palm leaf, in the Grantha character. The copy was made for me by Dr Julius Eggeling, who has thus laid me under deep obligation, and contributed most essentially to the success of my work. Hardly less than to him is my indebtedness to Dr Reinhold Rost, Secretary of the Royal Asiatic Society, who notified me of the existence of the manuscripts in the Society's library soon after their discovery, and who suggested and aided their transcription. There are doubtless few other Sanskritists in Europe, besides these gentlemen, to whom works written in the southern Indian characters are not sealed books, and there can be none, I am sure, who evince a more liberal readiness to make their peculiar knowledge of service to the rest. The catalogue which Dr Rost is preparing to publish of the Royal Asiatic Society's collection of manuscripts will give such other particulars respecting age, condition, etc., as I am compelled here to omit.

6 **M** The library of the same Society also contains a second copy of the *Pratīcākhya* and its commentary, written on paper, in the Malayālam character. Of this, Dr Eggeling has taken the pains to note the various readings as compared with the Grantha manuscript, in his transcript of the latter.

Both these manuscripts from southern India are so arranged

that the rules of the *Prâtigākhyā* are given first, in a body, and are followed by the commentary, also in bulk

As regards the text of the *Prâtigākhyā* itself, all these authorities agree very closely there are but two or three cases of well-established variations of reading among them. In respect to the text of the commentary, their accordance, as was to be expected, is much less they fall, in fact, into three well-marked classes, or, as one might say, present three different recensions of the work. The two codices belonging to the Royal Asiatic Society, the Grantham ("G") and the Malayalam ("M"), stand in the nearest possible relation to one another, having almost all their errors, omissions, and orthographical peculiarities in common, and only by comparatively rare and inconspicuous differences proved not to be copied the one from the other. My own manuscript ("W") and that sent by Dr Buhler from Bombay ("B") also offer substantially the same text, although their differences are much more frequent, and of a more important character, than those of G and M. As for the Oxford manuscript ("O"), it is, in its earlier portions, pretty closely accordant with W and B, having an especially near relationship to B, with whose slight variations of the text given by W it almost uniformly agrees, later, however, it strikes off upon a track of its own, and comes to differ from both the other recensions in a much greater degree than they differ between themselves.

Such being the case, I have thought it best to adopt for publication the version offered by W, partly because this is the only one for which I possess an original manuscript (and a tolerably old and correct one), partly because it is, upon the whole, better supported than that of G and M—which, as I have shown above, can hardly be reckoned, both together, as constituting more than a single manuscript. I have accordingly, avoiding the making up of an eclectic text from the various recensions, followed W as closely as I could, and especially, when it was supported by the joint authority of B and O, or of B alone—thus sometimes, undoubtedly, rejecting an intrinsically preferable and perhaps more original reading given by one or another of the remaining authorities, if that offered by W was of a character to be endured. At the end of the comment to each rule are given the various readings of all the manuscripts, with sufficient fullness, I hope, to answer the desirable ends of critical comparison. Obvious and trifling errors of transcription, of course, I have not noted, but only those which made a false reading or tended to become such. I have been most liberal in overlooking the blunders of B, as being, on the whole, of least consequence.

In regard, however, to the two matters of punctuation and euphonic combination, I have taken liberties with the text of which I have given no account. The various manuscripts are in no slight degree discordant with one another, inconsistent with themselves, and careless of the requirements of the sense, in the use they make of the signs of interpunction they offer absolutely

no standard to follow For the occurrence of the signs as printed, therefore, I am alone responsible, and no one who can anywhere make a better division of clauses than I have made need be restrained from so doing by the belief that he is running counter to manuscript authority Again, I have (except in certain cases at the end of a cited rule or passage, where a reference follows) put all the words of the commentary in euphonic combination according to the usual rules, while in the manuscripts (as is common in exegetical writings) they are very frequently, for the sake of greater clearness, separated from one another* Here, too, the usage of the various authorities is too discordant and irregular to be followed And to report their readings in these two particulars would burden the critical notes with a mass of useless and wearisome details

In the same manner are treated such orthographical peculiarities of the several manuscripts as that G and M regularly write a final sibilant instead of *visarjaniya* before an initial sibilant, and often, where a *m* is assimilated to a following mute, write the nasal mute corresponding to the latter, instead of *anusvāra* Moreover, in the representation of the nasal sounds, by the nasal consonants, *anusvāra* (ॠ), or *m*, I have followed a consistent method, with disregard of the manuscript usage

The text given at the foot of the page contains the whole comment, with two exceptions citations from the Tāttirīya-Saṁhitā, being written out in full, with references, in the notes to the rules, are indicated below only by first words or letters, with signs of omission added, and again, where lists of affected words are given in a rule, in euphonic combination, and repeated, separate, at the beginning of the comment, they are replaced by signs of omission, as having been sufficiently presented uncombined in the translation of the rule Errors of reading in the cited passages themselves are passed without notice, unless of such importance as to cast doubt upon the identity of the passage, but, on the other hand, the frequent differences of the versions as regards the extent of the illustrative passage cited are fully noted in the sequel of the reference

I have preferred, instead of giving an express and direct translation of the commentary, to work its substance fully into my own notes upon the rules, somewhat as in my edition of the Atharva Prāṭiśākhya (Journ Am Or Soc'y, Vol vii, 1862) The different conditions of the case, however, impress quite a different character upon the present work The completeness and elaborateness of the Tribhāshyaratna make its working-up by far the larger and more important part of what is to be done in illustration of the Prāṭiśākhya Possessing no *index verborum* to the Tāttirīya-Saṁhitā, nor even a manuscript of its *pada*-text, I have not been able to try the Prāṭiśākhya by it with anything like the same

* Thus, to instance an extreme case, at the end of the comment on iv 10, the manuscripts read (for once, with almost perfect unanimity) *ṛgyasya antah ṛgyāntah na ṛgyāntah anṛgyāntah*

thoroughness as in the case of the similar treatise to the Atharvan. What could be done in the way of testing and supplementing the rules given, by a careful reading and excerption of the *Sanhitā* in a single good *samhitā*-manuscript (also procured for me in India by Dr Hall, and with one or two slight deficiencies in it made up from Berlin, by Prof Weber), I have endeavored to do. I have been able to refer points of interest connected with the text, in its *samhitā* or *pada* readings, to friends in Europe owning or having access to fuller manuscript material, namely to Professors Weber of Berlin and Haug of Munchen, and have received from them important aid, which I desire here gratefully to acknowledge. Of references to the teachings of the other *Prāticākhya*s I have been much more sparing in this than in the former work, in order to avoid repetition and, for the same reason, some matters of theory which were pretty fully discussed there receive here a more compendious treatment. The present work, in short, to a certain extent presupposes the other—not, however, in such a manner or degree as should interfere with its independence and separate intelligibility.

In making reference to the *Tāttirīya-Sanhitā*, I have used only three principal numbers, to designate book, chapter, and section, or *kānda*, *pragna*, and *anuvāka*. The further division of the sections or *anuvākas*, where they are of more considerable length, into parcels of fifty words each, is so artificial, destructive of the natural connection of passages, detrimental to the proper phonetic form of the text, and wholly ignored by the *Prāticākhya* (see notes to the rules of chapter iii), that I have preferred to express it by the use of "superior" figures attached to that which indicates the *anuvāka*. Of course, where such attached figure is wanting, the *anuvāka* is to be understood as composed of a single division.

In the notes of various readings, each figure refers only to the single word to which it is attached, unless a passage of more than one word is included between two repetitions of the same figure, in which case the reference figure, in the notes, is put within parentheses. The abbreviation "om" means 'omit,' and "ins" means 'insert.'

In all transliterated passages of Sanskrit, a colon stands in place of a single stroke of interpunction, and a full stop in place of a double stroke. The general method of transliteration is the same with that which I have hitherto used in the *Journal of the American Oriental Society*, it will be sufficiently understood from the alphabet given in the note to i 1 (p 10)

CHAPTER I

CONTENTS 1-11, enumeration and classification of sounds composing the alpha bet, 12-14, surd and sonant consonants, 15, list of prepositions, 16-21, 27, names of letters and classes of letters, 22-24, 28, terminology of cited words, etc., 25, 26, 29, 30, respecting the interpretation of rules, 31-37, quantity of simple sounds, 38-40, the three accents, 41-47, details respecting the circum flex accent, 48, 49, compound words, 50-53, respecting cited words, 54-55, words consisting of a single vowel, 56-61, further specifications respecting the interpretation of rules

THE commentator begins his work with a couple of rather awkwardly-constructed verses, as follows "I, bowing low with devoted affection to the two feet of Ganega, as also to the *gurus* and to divine Voice, shall proceed to utter this comment, which, made upon examination of the exposition of the Prāṭiśākhya given by Vararuci etc, shines, a Treasure of Threefold Comment (*tribhāshyaratna*), approved of Brahmans" He adds an exposition of their meaning, explaining *giram devīm*, 'divine Voice,' by *vāgdevīm*, 'Goddess of Voice,' and *bhāsura*, 'Brahman' (literally 'earth-god'), by *vidvat*, 'learned man, sage' On *lakshana*, which, as name of a comment, is least in accordance

'bhaktiyuktah pranamyā 'ham ganegacaranadvayam
gurūn api giram² devīm idam vakshyāmi lakshanam 1
vyākhyānam prāṭiśākhyaśya vikshya vārarucādīham³
krtam tribhāshyaratnam yad bhāsate bhāsurapriyam 2

glokeyor anayor ayaṁ⁴ arthah bhaktiyukto 'ham ganegacaranadvayam gurūn giram⁵ api devīm vāgdevīm ity arthah tām ca⁶ pranamyā lakshanam idam vakshyāmi ya⁷ lakshanam tribhāshyaratnanāmakam bhāsurapriyam vidvatpriyam bhāsate kīdr-
ṣam lakshanam prāṭiśākhyaśya vyākhyānarūpakam⁸ vārarucā-
dīkam⁹ bhāshyaśyatam vikshya¹⁰ nyūnātirekacaparīdhrena krtam v-
racitam ādīṣādenā¹¹ trayānāḥśheyāu grhyete ata eva tribhā-
shyaratnam itī nāmna upapattih trayānām bhāshyānām samā-
hāras tribhāshyam tasya¹¹ ratnam bhāshanam

¹ W prefaces with *ṛiganeḍya namaḥ ṛiganeḍa prasanno 'stu om* B pre faces with *ṛiganeḍya namaḥ ṛisurasvatya namaḥ ṛidattānnayā namaḥ* and the additional verse

*śuklāmbaradharam devam ca, varnam caturbhujam
prasannavadanam dhyaet sarvavighnopapāditaye 1*

'The white raiment-bearing god, moon hued, four armed, propitious-faced, must one meditate on, in order to the surcease of all disturbance' It then numbers the other² verses "2" and "3," but proceeds to confess the ungenuneness of the inserted verse by reading, like the other MSS, *anayoh glokeyoh*

² G M *giran* ³ B *var* ⁴ G M *om* ⁵ G M *giram* ⁶ G M *om* ⁷ G M *ta* ⁸ G M *-rupam*, B *purvakam* ⁹ B *var*, W *ka* ¹⁰ G M *śamvikshya*

¹¹ W *om*

with common usage, he makes no remark To *vikshya*, 'having examined,' he adds *nyānātmekuparīhārena*, 'with avoidance of deficiency and redundancy' The "etc" after "Vararuci" is declared to refer to Ātreya and Māhīsheya, these three being the authorities upon which the present work is founded, and from which it derives its name Vararuci and Māhīsheya are, indeed, often (about ten times each see Index) referred to in the sequel, and then discordant views sometimes set forth and discussed Ātreya has only once (under v 1) the honor of being mentioned Who is the digester of their three works, and author of the present commentary, which has taken their place and crowded them out of existence, we are not informed, nor, so far as I am aware, has any evidence bearing upon the point been anywhere brought to knowledge Notice of the different authorities cited by our commentator will be put together in an additional note at the end of this work, for the sake of the light cast by them upon his age

अथ वर्णसामानाद्यः ॥ १ ॥

1 Now the list of sounds

The commentator first gives himself a great deal of trouble to explain the meaning of *atha*, 'now,' in the rule He quotes Amara's definition of *atho* and *atha* (Amarakosha iii 4 32 8, p 349 of Deslongchamps's edition), and points out that, as a variety of meanings is there attributed to *atha*, it is necessary to fix upon a single meaning for it here In the first place, then, a propitiatory significance is claimed for it, by reason of its equivalence with *om*, "since the Çikshā-makers declare, 'om and *atha* are deemed propitiatory'" Or, again, it indicates something coming next after another, "the implication being that, next after the reading of the Veda, one should gain a knowledge of the *lakṣhaṇa* there hav-

1 *maṅgalānantarādrambhapraçnakārtsnyeshv atho atke 'ti maṅgalādyane-kārthatvād athaçubdasyā 'rthanarmayārtham eho 'rtho' niçcetavyah tatra prathamam tāvan maṅgalārthatvam ucyate tasya pranavasādharmyāt tathā hi samācakshate çikshāk ārah'*

omkāraç cā 'thaçabdaç ca maṅgalāv iti kīrtitāv iti āho' svid ānantaryārthatā' vedādhyayanānantaram liṅsha-nayñānam kuryād iti sāpekshatvāl lakṣhaṇasya pūrvam vedādhy-gaṇe saty atha lakṣhaṇuparīhāvasarah ~~atha~~ vā 'dhikārārtho 'thaçabdah tv atha 've 'ti vinivartakād dhikārakāva-dhārakāh (xxii 6) iti vidyamānatvāt atha varnasamāmnāyah pāthakramo' dhikrīyate iti sūtrānvayah sam ity ekibhāve ān iti madyādāyam mnāya ity ānupūrvyeno 'padeṣah' ekibhātā akārādāyo varnāh svarabhaktiparyavasānānupūrvyena pūrvāh çishtāt' upaśiṣtāt

ing been study of the Veda before the *lakshana*, now comes the occasion for the investigation of the *lakshana*." Here, *lakshana* appears to be used to designate the Prâtisâkhyâ itself, as above it denoted the commentary to the latter. Once more, *atha* is declared to have the force of an introduction or heading, according to rule xxii 6, below "tu, *atha*, and *eva* are respectively exceptive, introductory, and limitative," and the connection of the rule is that now the ' ' of sounds, the order of reading (*pâthakrama*), is made the subject of treatment.

The composition of *samâmnâya*, 'list, rehearsal,' is next pointed out, and the word is stated to mean "the collective sounds, beginning with *a* and ending with the *svarabhakti*, in their order, as taught by former learned men."

The catalogue itself follows, as understood by the commentator to be taught or implied in the rules of the treatise. First come the vowels, of which only sixteen are reckoned (see rule 5, below) *a*, *i*, and *u* have each a short, a long, and a protracted value, *r* only a short and a long, *l* only a short (W and B take the pains to write a figure 2 after the long *r*, and a 1 after the *l*, to point out clearly the number of *moras* they respectively contain, and B adds after the *â* and *ô* a 2, for the same purpose), second, the twenty-five mutes (see rule 7), third, the four semivowels (rule 8), and fourth, the six spirants (rule 9). This makes fifty-one sounds, clearly specified and counted in their order in the next succeeding rules. Of the rest, there is no so direct enumeration, the commentator has to infer them from their recognition by rules found in later portions of the treatise. Thus, he finds *anusvâra* acknowledged as an alphabetic element in rule 34 of this chapter, which teaches that it has the quantity of a short vowel, for, he says, "since it is made the substrate of a specific quantity, it is itself a concrete thing, and not, like nasalization, a quality." A passage from the Çikshâ, it is true, appears inconsistent with this, but finds its sufficient explanation in the circumstance that that work includes in one expression the concrete thing and its quality. The cited passage is not to be found in the known text of the

tathâ hi a â âs i î is u û ū r ṛ ḷ e â o ô u iti svarâh shodapâ
ka kha ga gha âa ca cha ja jha âa ta tha da dha na ta tha da
dha na pa pha ba bha ma iti sparśâh pañcaviṅcatih ya ra la va
iti catasro 'ntasthâh ga sha sa ha hka⁸ hpa⁹ iti shad âshmanuh.
anusvâraç ca (i 34) iti sûtrenâ 'nusvâra uktah kâlûvîpeshâ-
grayatvâd asû 11 dharmâ na tv¹⁰ anunâsikavad¹¹ dharmah. vi-
dher 12 madhyasthandâsikyâ¹³ iti çikshâvacane¹⁴ sati¹⁵ dharmadhar-
minor abhedavvakshayo 'papadyate atha visarjantiyah
(viii 5) ity anena¹⁶ visarjantiya uktah nâsikâdvivaranâd ânu-
nâsikyam (ii 52) ity anena¹⁶ raṅga uktah prktaşvarât paro
lo dam (xiii 16) ity anena¹⁶ lakâra uktah sparśâd unuttamâd
(xxi.12) iti catvâro yanâ uktâh repḥoshmasamyoge repḥa-
svarâbhaktiḥ (xxi.15) iti svarabhaktir uktâ anena kramena

Çikshâ (and the same is the case with several of the passages quoted later see the additional notes) it is given again, with more fullness, under viii 15. Next, for the *visarjanīya*, which our Prātiçākhyā does not count among the spirants, is given as authority rule 5 of the eighth chapter, a rule introductory to the euphonic changes of a final *h*. The commentator brings in as next constituent of the alphabet an element which he calls *raṅga*, and for which he cites the rule (ii.52) that “nasal qual’ is given by the unclosing of the nasal passage.” The word *raṅga*, ‘coloring,’ though a common name for the nasal tinge of utterance, is not found in our Prātiçākhyā, nor even used in the commentary excepting here and under ii 52. What is described in the latter rule is in fact a “quality” (*dharma*), and not a “qualified” or concrete thing (*dharman*), and its inclusion in the alphabet would stultify the argument with which the inclusion of *anusvāra* was but just now supported. It would seem that the commentator ought to be aiming here at the *nāsikya*, or euphonic insertion between *h* and a following nasal mute, and should quote for it rule xxi 14, he does not otherwise take account of it in his list, while yet it is precisely as well entitled to a place there as are the *yamas*. The nasalized semivowels, it is true, into which *n* and *m* are directed to be converted before *y*, *l*, *v* (v 26-8), are also left out of the enumeration, unless we suppose the *raṅga* to be meant to apply to their nasality, and I think it altogether likely that the commentator had them in view in its definition but this is only avoiding one difficulty by running into two worse ones—namely, by omitting the *nāsikya*, and by reckoning as a member of the alphabet what is really only one of the constituent elements of certain sounds. Further, rule xiii 16 is made the warrant for the lingual *l*, rule xxi 12 for the four *yamas*, and rule xxi 15, finally, for the *svarabhakti* and the conclusion is reached that “by this process, the number of sixty is clearly derivable from the rules themselves as that of the letters in the Yajur-Veda.”

*yāgyur-vedikavarnānām*¹⁷ *shashtisamkhyā sūtrata eva vispashtā draṣṭavyā nanu*

*trishashtic catuṣshashtir vā varnāḥ gambhūmate*¹⁸ *matāḥ*
*iti çikshāvacane satri katham shashtisamkhyā nīyamate etal*¹⁹
*lūḍikavādīkasaṁvavarnavishūyam*²⁰ *iti*²¹ *çikshāvacane na viro-*
*dhaḥ atra tu*²² *sūtrāṁ etāvutām varnānām*²³ *evo ’pulumhād eṣha*
*eva*²⁴ *nirṇayo varṇitah*²⁵

• *varnānām samānīndyo varṇasamāmnāyah*

(1) G M mangalādyanekārtho (2) W G M çiksh G and M always write çikshā, B and O always çikshā, W has ç only in one other place (under xiv 28)
3 W B aho (4) G M ryatā, W adds vā (5) G M pathe kramo (6) W B om
7 W çishyār (8) B shka (9) B shpa (10) G M om (11) B dharmānāwād amu-
sakah (12) G ins dāharma (13) G M -kād (14) G M nam (15) B om, G M tū
16 B G M om (17) W -vād- (18) B amgūmate (19) G M tal (20) G M svar-
ṇavarna- (21) G M ins na. (22) G M om (23) G M om (24) G M om (25) B nir-
nitah

An objection is now raised and removed "Considering that the Çikshâ says 'the letters are regarded as sixty-three or sixty-four, in the opinion of Çambhu' (Çikshâ, verse 3, see Weber's edition of the treatise, in his Indische Studien, iv 348-9), how is the number sixty established? Answer there is no inconsistency with the *dictum* of the Çikshâ, seeing that the latter has in view the whole body of sounds, as used both in the Veda and in common life, while here the determination (of sixty) is derived from the assumption of just so many letters by the rules of the treatise"

The alphabetic scheme is, then, as follows

Vowels	{ simple, impure and diphthongs,	<i>a ā ās i ī is u ū ūs</i>	9	16
		<i>r ṛ l e ē o ōu</i>	7	
Mutes	{ guttural, palatal, lingual, dental, labial,	<i>k kh g gh ṅ</i>	5	25
		<i>c ch j jh ṇ</i>	5	
		<i>t th d dh n</i>	5	
		<i>ṭ ṭh ḍ ḍh n</i>	5	
		<i>p ph b bh m</i>	5	
Semivowels,		<i>y r l v</i>	4	
Spirants,		<i>ś ṣ sh s ṣ h</i>	6	
Anusvāra,		<i>ṁ</i>	1	
Visarjanīya,		<i>h</i>	1	
Lingual l,		<i>l</i>	1	
Nāsikya,		(not written)	1	
Yamas,		do	4	
Svarabhakti,		do	1	
whole number of letters,			60	

With the exception of the nasal *y, l, v*, already referred to, this list includes all the alphabetic sounds treated of by the Prāticākhya. For what concerns the peculiarities of their character or classification, see the special rules of which they are the subject, as also, for the differences between the teachings of this and of the other kindred treatises with reference to them. Only the Vājasaneyi-Prāticākhya includes in its text a complete list and enumeration of letters, and that by an afterthought, in a later and less genuine chapter (viii 1-31)

अथ नवादितः समानाक्षराणि ॥३॥

2 Now the nine at the beginning are simple vowels.

2 *athe 'ti samyñādhakārārthak' asmin¹ varnasamāmnāya ādita ārabhya nava varnāḥ samānāksharasamyñā bhavanti 'yathā a ā ās i ī is u ū ūs samyñādyāḥ' prayojanam dīrghaṇi samānākshare savarnapare (x 2) ity ādi. nanv idrṣi mahatī samyñā kumarthā² çikshādīçāstraprasāddhyamurodhāye³ 'ti brāmah*

¹ B *tasmin* ² W B *a ā ās ity ādi* ³ G M *jñā* ⁴ G M *-tham* ⁵ G M *om. ā-*

Literally, 'are homogeneous syllables,' *samānākshara* and its correlative *samāhyakshara*, 'syllable of combination,' being the current names for simple vowel and for diphthong, the latter, however, is not used in this treatise. The nine intended are, as shown in the preceding list, *a ā ī e ī ī ṛ u ū ṛ*. The *r* and *l* vowels are denied the quality of simplicity or homogeneity, although their structure as composed of heterogeneous elements is not further described, the Rik Pr (xii 14), the Vāj Pr (iv 145), and the Ath Pr (i 37-9) give the details of their formation, while nevertheless the two first expressly include *r* and *l* among the *samānāksharas* (omitting *l*, apparently, because no case anywhere occurs that should test its quality), and the same classification is inferribly recognized by the last.

The commentator explains the *atha* of this rule as signifying the introduction of the subject of names or technical appellations (*samyñā*), and cites, as example of the use of the term, rule x 2, respecting the coalescence of two similar simple vowels into a long vowel. Finally, the unwieldiness of the long word *samānākshara* striking his mind, he asks "why such a big name?" and relieves himself by the answer, "we say, in order to correspond with the established usage of the Çikshā and other text-books." The Çikshā as we know it, it may be remarked, does not employ the term

द्वे सवर्णे ह्रस्वदीर्घे ॥ ३ ॥

3 Two and two, short and long, are similar

That is to say, as the commentary explains, of these simple vowels, two and two short, two and two long, or a long and a short, are called "similar." The meaning seems rather to be that, of the three triplets which make up the category of simple vowels, the first two in each triplet, the short and the long, will be designated as "similar"—to the exclusion, namely, of the *phata* or protracted vowels. The term is used but once in the treatise (namely in x 2, the rule last above quoted), as applied to vowels, and nothing is practically gained by denying its inclusion of the protracted vowels, since these are specially protected from coalescence by the rule x 24. The *r*-vowels are here again shut out, as in the preceding rule, and, in fact, no case occurs in the Vedic text in which two of them are fused into one.

3 *teshu* *samānākshareshu* *dvedve* *hrasve* *dvedve* *dirghe* ² *hrasva-dirghe* ³ *dirghahrasve* *vā* ¹ *kshare* *parasparam* *savarnasamyñe* *bhavatah* *vyam* *anvartahasamyñā* *savarnatvam* *nāma* *sādr̥cya* *ucyate* *tasmād* *akārādīnām* *akārādibhir* *na* *savarnasamyñāṣaṅkā* *bhavanasthānaprayatnatvād* *anayoh* *samyñāyāh* *prayojanam.* ⁴ *dirghaṅ* *samānākshare* *savarnapare* (x 2) *iti*.

hrasvam *ca* *dirgham* *ca* *hrasvadirghe*

¹ G M *teshu* ² G M *ms* *vā* ³ B *om*, G M *ms* *dirghaṅ* ⁴ B

The word translated 'similar' means literally 'of identical color' (1 e sound), and is several times applied later to identity of consonantal sound. It is, as the commentator points out, a self-explaining term, or one whose application is directly in accordance with its natural meaning (*anvārtha*), and hence no suspicion is to be entertained of the inclusion of *a* and *i*, for instance, as "similar," because of their different mode of organic production. As example of the use of the term is again cited x 2

न प्लुतपूर्वम् ॥४॥

4 Not so, when a protracted vowel precedes

This is an arbitrary exclusion, made to fit a particular case, which might with more evident propriety have been provided for later, where such cases are under treatment, rather than here in the preliminary definition of terms (compare a somewhat similar case in the Rik Pr, 11, r 4). The commentator paraphrases the rule "a simple vowel having a protracted one before it is not termed 'similar,'" and goes on to cite and explain in full the case to which it applies. In the phrase *agne īti āha* (vi 5 8⁴), the word *agne* has its final diphthong protracted, and becomes *āgnā'si*. By the rule (x 2) for the coalescence of two similar simple vowels into the corresponding long vowel, this would then unite with the following word to form *āgnā'si'iti*. The quality of similarity, however, being denied by the present rule to the final *i*, it is treated as a dissimilar vowel, being first converted into *y* by rule x 15, the *y* dropped by x 19, and the coalescence of the remaining *ās* with the following *i* (as prescribed by x 4) prevented by x 24 thus is assured the reading *āgnā's īty āha*

षोडशादितः स्वराः ॥५॥

5 The sixteen at the beginning are vowels

Namely, says the commentator, the sixteen beginning with *a* and ending with *au*. As example of the use of the technical term

4 *plutapūrvam samānāksharam savarnasamyññam na bhavati. plutam asmāt pūrvam īti plutapūrvam yathā agnā's īty āhe 'ity atra dīrghaṇ samānākshare savarnapare (x.2) ity ekādēṣaḥ prasaktah tuc cā 'nishtam prutishiddhāyām tv evaṇ savarnasamyññāyām pārīṣeṣhyād vvarṇokārāu yavakārāv (x 15) īti pūrvasye 'kārasya yatvam syāt'. sa ca yakāro lupyete tv avarṇapūrvāu yavakārāv (x 19) īti lupyate. yakāre lupte sati vvarṇapara ekāram (x.4) ity ekārāḥ³ prasaktah: so² pi¹ nishidhyate na plutapragrahāv (x 24) ity anena tasmād āgnā's īty āhe 'iti prasidhyati⁴*

¹ W om ² G M, ekādēṣaḥ ³ G M v ⁴ G M sidhyati

svara, 'vowel,' he quotes the rule (ix 10) prescribing the conversion of *visarjanīya* into *y* before a vowel

Our *Prātiśākhya* is to be commended for not including in its list of vowels the long *l*, and for postulating no useless protracted forms of *r* and *l*

शेषो व्यञ्जनानि ॥ ६ ॥

6 The rest are consonants

As example of the term *vyañjana*, 'consonant,' rule xxi 1, which pronounces the consonant a member of the adjacent vowel, is cited in the commentary, according to the two manuscripts from northern India, those from the south substitute for it the opening rule of the third chapter, and also omit the explanatory statement "beginning with *k* and ending with *svarabhakti*," which is given by the others

आद्याः पञ्चविंशति स्पर्शाः ॥ ७ ॥

7 The first twenty-five are mutes

The commentator explains "among the consonants, the first twenty-five letters are called mutes" (*sparga*, literally 'contact') The northern manuscripts add, as under the last rule, "beginning with *k* and ending with *m*" It is next pointed out that rules 2 and 5 contain the specification *ādītaḥ*, 'at the beginning,' and that the different phraseology of this rule, namely *ādīyāḥ*, 'first,' indicates a difference of meaning it signifies that the sounds referred to

5 *varnasamāmnāyasyā*¹ "dīta śrabhya śhodaṣa varnāḥ svarasamjñā bhavanti akārādāya śukāraparyantā ity arthah samjñādyāḥ prayojanam atha svaraparo yakāram (ix 10) ity ādi.

¹ G M *varnānām sam-*

6 *svarebhyaḥ śeṣho varnarāṣṭar vyāñjunasamjño bhavati* ¹*lakārādisvarabhaktiparyantā ity arthah*¹ *samjñādyāḥ prayojanam* ²*vyāñjanaṁ svarānṅam*² (xxi 1) *iti*

(¹) G M om (²) G M *athā* "dāu uttare vibhāge hrasvanī vyāñjanapara (iii 1)

7 *vyāñyaneṣu ādyāḥ pañcaviṃśativarnā sparṇasamjñā bhavanti* ¹*lakārādāyo mahārāntāḥ*¹ ²*samjñādyāḥ prayojanam* *sparga sparṇaparāḥ* (xiv 27)² *atha navā* "dītaḥ samā nākṣharāni (12) *śhodaṣā* "dītaḥ svarāḥ (15) *itvad ādīta* *iti vaktavya ādyā* *iti śabdāntaraprayogo* 'rthāntarasācakah *vyāñyaneṣu ādyā na tu svareṣu ādyā* *iti vyñeyam*³

(¹) G M om (²) G M remove to end of exposition, and for *spargaparāḥ* read *sparga* *ity ādi* ³ G M *jñeyam*

are first among the consonants, not first among the vowels (better, we should say, not first in the whole list) Of this style of interpretation, which forces a special significance into very innocent variations of phraseology, we shall meet with other and more striking examples farther on

Rule xiv 27 is given as instance of the employment of the technical term here defined

पराश्रतस्रो ऽन्तस्थाः ॥ ८ ॥

8 The next four are semivowels

The four semivowels are *y, r, l, v* The rule cited by the commentary in illustration of the use of the term "semivowel" (*anta-sthā*, १ e *antah-sthā*, 'standing between, intermediate [between consonant and vowel]' see note to Ath Pr 130) is one (v 28) prescribing the treatment of final *m* before an initial semivowel

परे षडूष्माणः ॥ ९ ॥

9 The next six are spirants

Namely, the three sibilants, *ś, ṣ, h*, and the *jhvāmālīya, ṣ*, the *upadhmanīya, ṣ*, and the aspiration, *h* As regards the sounds to which the name *ūshman*, 'flatus,' shall be given, the phonetic treatises are greatly at variance The Vaj P1 (viii 22) limits the class to the sibilants and *h*, the Ath Pr (see note to 131) apparently adds the guttural and labial spirants and the more indistinct *visarjanīya*, the Rik Pr (1 2), these and the *anusvāra* We have an equal right to be surprised at the inclusion of this last in the class, and at the exclusion from it, by our treatise, of the *visarjanīya*

To instance the employment of "spirant," the comment cites the rule (xiv 16) forbidding the duplication of a spirant before a vowel

स्पर्शानामानुपूर्व्येण पञ्चपञ्च वर्गाः ॥ १० ॥

10 Of the mutes, the successive fives are the series

The commentary paraphrases "among the mutes, five and five sounds, in their order, have the designation 'series,' they begin respectively with *k, c, t, ṭ, p*, and end with *ñ, ṇ, n, ṇ, m*" This

8. *spārṣebhyaḥ pare catvāro varnā antasthāsamyñā bhavanti samyñdyāḥ prayojanam.* 'antasthāparaḥ ca savarnam anusīkam (v 28) ity ādi

¹ A lacuna in W, extending to the word *prayojanam* in the commentary to the next rule

.. 9 *antasthābhyaḥ pare śaḍ varnā ūshmasamyñā bhavanti samyñdyāḥ prayojanam ūshmā svaraparāḥ* (xiv.16) ity ādi

exposition is in accordance with the requirements of the context, the treatise being here engaged in defining its technical terms. Otherwise, we might divide ---- *pañca pañcavargāḥ*, and translate, like the corresponding rule in the Rik Pr (12), 'there are five series, of five each'.

The illustrative rule (xiv 20) cited in the comment teaches the non-duplication of a mute of the lingual series before one of the dental series

प्रथमद्वितीयतृतीयचतुर्थीत्तमाः ॥ ११ ॥

11 And are called first, second, third, fourth, and last

Each series of five mutes, that is to say, is composed of a surd, a surd aspirate, a sonant, a sonant aspirate, and a nasal, as *t, th, d, dh, n*, and these classes are named according to their order in the several series. The commentator makes no note here of the physical differences of the classes, but says "In each series, the sounds, in their order, are styled first, second, third, fourth, and last. Even though a name founded on enumeration obviously belongs to them [is assured them, without a special rule to that effect], yet, for the purpose of denying appellation on the ground of any other enumeration, the technical terms 'first' and so on are prescribed, to enjoin a certain enumeration (?) How so? Why, to establish the designation 'first' and so on for *k* and its successors alone, and to deny to the vowels, semivowels, spirants, etc., designations founded on their enumeration." And he proceeds to cite four rules (ii 9, xiv 12, 24, viii 3 but the southern MSS cite v 38 instead of ii 9) as examples of the use of the five terms defined

10 *sparsānām madhya ānupūrvyena pañcapañca varṇāḥ var-gasamyñā bhavanti ka-ca-ta-ta-pādayo² śa-śa-na-na-māntā ity arthaḥ samyñādyāḥ prayojanam tavargaḥ ca tavargaparaḥ* (xiv 20) *iti*³

¹ B om ² G M *pādyāḥ* ³ W om the cited rule, G M *ity dāḥ*

11 *ekāḥkasmin vārge yathākramena¹ varṇāḥ prathamadvitīyatrīyacaturthottamāsamyñā bhavanti siddhe 'pi samkhyānam itte nāmāḥ² samkhyāntarānabhidhānārtham³ samkhyāntarāni⁴ kathamāyitum prathamādīsamyñādvulhānam tat katham kakārādīnām eva⁵ prathamādīsamyñāpratyayārtham svarāntasthoshma-prabhṛtśhu tatsamkhyādsamyñāpratishedhārtham⁶ samyñādyāḥ prayojanam prathama āśvīnaparo dvitīyam (xiv 12) trītiyaṅ svaraghoshavatparaḥ (viii 3) kakāro kacaturtheshu (ii 9)⁷ nā 'nuttama uttama paraḥ (xiv.24)⁸ ity dāḥ*

¹ G M *-kramam* ² G M *nāmāḥ* ³ B *samkhyāntarānāḥ*, G M *samkhyānāḥ* ⁴ M *samyñāntaram* as to the true reading and interpretation of this clause I am by no means confident ⁵ G M om ⁶ G M *tu samkhyā* ⁷ G M substitute for this rule part of v 38, viz *prathamapūrvā kakāraḥ caturtham tasya sastiṇām*

The other Prâtiçākhyas employ the same designations for the mutes (save that the Vâj Pr also calls the nasals *pañcama*, 'fifth'), but without taking the trouble to define them or prescribe their use by a rule

उष्मविसर्जनीयप्रथमद्वितीया अघोषाः ॥ १२ ॥

12 The spirants, *visarjanîya*, and the first and second mutes, are surd

The Rik Pr gives (1 2,3) a similar statement, the Ath Pr uses the terms "surd" and "sonant" without defining which consonants form each class, the Vâj Pr (1 50-53) substitutes for the terms arbitrary formulas

The physical peculiarity of the surd utterance is defined in the next chapter (rules 5,10)

The commentator illustrates the use of the term by the rule (1x 2) concerning the treatment of *visarjanîya* before a surd

न हकारः ॥ १३ ॥

13 But not *h*

"*H* is not styled a surd, this is an exception rendered necessary by the circumstance that *h*, being [by 1 9] a spirant, would otherwise be included [by the last rule] in the class of surds," says the comment

All the phonetic treatises treat *h* as a sonant For further definition of its character, see rules 11 6,9,46,47, below

व्यञ्जनशेषो घोषवान् ॥ १४ ॥

14 The rest of the consonants are sonant

The commentary enters into a rather lengthy defense of the propriety of this rule, which reads literally as follows "The remainder of the consonants other than the surds is styled sonant Even though, when the surds have already been stated in rule 12, the sonant quality of the rest, on the principle of 'remainder,' is assured—just as, when it is said, 'of Devadatta and Yajñadatta,

12 *ūshmanāṣ ca visarjanîyaṣ ca prathamadvitîyāṣ ca 'gho-
shasamyñā bhavanti samyñdyāḥ prayojanam aghoṣhaparas
tasya sasthānam ūshmanam*² (1x 2) *ity ādā*³

¹ B *prathamāṣ ca dv* ² W B omit the last two words of the rule ³ G M om.

13 *na bhavaty aghoṣhasamyñō¹ hakarāḥ ūshmatvād agho-
shāṭve prāpte tadāpavādo 'yam*

¹ W *-ñōko*

Devadatta owns no kine,' the conclusion is assured that Yajña-datta is a kine-owner—nevertheless, the indication of the technical term is made in the text-book, for the sake of practical convenience (?) Also, because of the superiority of express mention over inclusion in a remainder Otherwise—the name of surd is denied to *h* by rule 13, nor is *h* sonant, there being no rule to that effect, and so with the rest of the consonants, the vowels are also in like manner not sonant and not surd—this being the case, when the rule shall be given (ix 8) 'also when followed by a sonant,' the doubt would arise, 'followed by a sonant' means followed by what? Let not this be so in this view the present rule is undertaken" It is added "In this rule, the distinctive meaning, in the form of objection and replication, is set forth by Māhisheya" And the rule ix 8, already referred to, is quoted again by way of illustration of the use of the term "sonant"

The Rik Pr (13), after specifying the surd letters, leaves the sonants to be inferred *pārīṣeṣhyāt*, 'by the remainder-principle,' as is expressly pointed out in the commentary on the passage (see Regnier's edition, note to rule 1.12)

The vowels are not included under the designation *ghoshavant* 'sonant,' although (as is explained in rule 11 8) formed of the same material with the sonant consonants

Our treatise does not, like the other Prātīkāḥyas (R Pr 13, V Pr 154, A. Pr 110), define the "first" and "third" mutes as *soshman*, 'aspirated'

14 *aghoshebbhyo* ¹ *vyāñjanāṣeṣho ghoshavatsamyñño bhavati yady apy ūshmanvisarjanīyaprathameshv ² *aghosheshū* ³ *'kṛtेशु* *vyāñjanāṣeṣasya pārīṣeṣhyād ghoshavattvam siddham yathā* ⁴ *devadattayajñadattayor* ⁵ *apaṣur devadatta ity ukte* ⁶ *'parah paṣu-mān iti siddham tathā* ⁷ *'pi śāstre samvyavahārdharmam* ⁸ *samyññā-nirdeśah* ⁹ *krīyate pārīṣeṣhyād* ¹⁰ *api kanthokter viṣeṣhāt* ¹¹ *anyathā na hāḥārah* (1 13) *iti hāḥārasya* ¹² *'ghoṣhasamyññā nishādhyate nā* ¹³ *'pi hāḥāro ghoshavām vidhyabdhāvāt tathā* ¹⁴ *'va vyāñjanāṣeṣah svarā* ¹⁵ *api tatthā* ¹⁶ *na ghoshavanto nā* ¹⁷ *'py aghoshāḥ tathā satī* *ghoṣhāvātparaṣ ca* (ix 8) *iti yatra* ¹⁸ *vakshyati tatra* ¹⁹ *samdehah syāt ghoshavātparaṣo nāma kimpāra* ²⁰ *iti tan mā bhād* ²¹ *iti 'dam sūtram* ²² *ārabhyate**

vyāñjanāṣeṣhoh ²³ *vyāñjanāṣeṣah*

atra sūtre codyaparihāraṣā ²⁴ *esha viṣeṣho māsishyabdhā-shitah*

samjñāyāḥ prayojanam ghoshavātparaṣ ca (ix 8) *ity ādi*

¹ G M ins 'nyo ² G M ūshmanvisarjanīyē 'ty ³ B ins ca ⁴ W dattatīyor ⁵ W samhār ⁶ G M viṣeṣhāvāt ⁷ G M om ⁸ G M yatrāyatra ⁹ G M tatrāyatra ¹⁰ B śāstram ¹¹ G M repeat the rule itself here ¹² W om, B adds yāḥ eṣah ¹³ G M om rūpa

आप्रावोपाभ्यधिप्रतिपरिविनीत्युपसर्गाः ॥ १५ ॥

15 *Ā, pra, ava, upa, abhi, adhi, prati, par, vi, ni*—these are prepositions

These ten words are but half the number which are reckoned as prepositions by the Rik and Vāj Prāṭicākhyas (R P₁ xu 6, V Pr vi 24) and by Pāṇini (see the *gana prādayaḥ*). The commentator notes the discordance with Pāṇini, and inquires why the maker of this rule presumingly cuts short the list of prepositions with the word *iti* in it. His reply is, that only so many are recognized by the Yajur-Veda. Another objection which he raises and removes, arriving at the comfortable conclusion “therefore there is no discordance whatever,” I do not see the point of. The discordance is a real one, and difficult to explain. The term preposition (*upasarga*) is used in three of the rules of the treatise, viz vi 4 (which is the cited instance in the commentary), x 9, and xiv 8 for the bearing of the restriction in number, see the notes on those rules.

वर्णः कारोत्तरो वर्णाख्या ॥ १६ ॥

16 A sound followed by *kāra* is the name of that sound

That is, for example, *akāra* is the name of *a*, *ekāra* of *e*, and so on. The Vāj Pr (1.37) is the only other treatise which takes the trouble to prescribe this usage, common to them all. Our own refers to it also in a later rule (xxii 4). The word *kāra* means ‘making, producing’. It is in the rules of the Prāṭicākhya added not only to simple alphabetic sounds (*varṇa*) as their names, but also to syllables like *ah* and *an* (see below, rules 23, 53), and the

15 ---- *ity ete śabdā upasargasamjñā bhavanti nanu praparīpasamanvavanardurvyāḥ ityādi pāṇinīyā viśeṣena bhananti¹ ka-
tām atra sūtrakṛtā nirargalam upasargā ityabdena samkucitā
ucyante yajurvedaviśaya etāvanta eve 'ti mantavyam tarhi
praparāpasam² itī samuccaye viśeṣapāthah³ katham upalab-
hyatē⁴ utparatvavidhāne tasya tātparyam na tū 'pasargasamjñā-
vidhāne viśeṣapāthah⁵ tasmān na kenacid virodhah. samjñā-
yāḥ prayojanam upasarganishpūrvo 'nudātte pade (vi 4).
ityabdah prakāraṇācī*

¹ W B and G p m bhavanti ² B. praparāpasam, G M prāpasam ³ G M viśeṣah, W viśeṣam ⁴ B lakṣyate ⁵ W B viśeṣah p

16 *kārottaro varṇo varṇasyā 'khyā bhavati yathā. athā
'kārekārāv (iv 8) itī¹ kāraśabda uttaro yasmād asau kārot-
taraḥ*

¹ G M *ity ādi*

commentator very frequently uses it to make names for brief words, like *ca*

Rule iv 8, respecting *e* and *ī*, is the chosen illustration of the combination here taught

अकारव्यवेतो व्यञ्जनानाम् ॥ १७ ॥

17 But with an *a* interposed, in the case of the consonants

That is, the name of *k*, for instance, is (*k-a-kāra*) *kakāra*
Compare the equivalent rule, Vāj Pr 1 38

The commentator cites rule v 22, respecting the conversion of *t* to *c*

न विसर्जनीयत्रिह्वामूलीयोपध्मानीयानुस्वारनासि-
क्यानाम् ॥ १८ ॥

18 Not of *visarjanīya*, *jihvāmūliya*, *upadhmanīya*, *anu*
svāra, and the *nāsikyā*s

The term *nāsikyā* designates here, of course, the nasal figments taught in rules xxi 12-14. All these indistinct, hardly articulate, sounds must be spoken of by their descriptive titles, not by any name founded upon their form. The commentator explains that the appending of *kāra* to the sounds here specified—which would otherwise be regular, since they come under the category of *varṇa*, 'alphabetic elements'—is annulled by the rule adding as a reason, that they are nowhere met with thus treated. He then

17 *akāravavyavahato*¹ *varṇaḥ kārāḥ abaddottaro vyāñjanānām ākhyā bhavati yathā*² *takāraḥ cakāram* (v 22) *ity ādi akārena vyavahato*³ *'kāravyavetaḥ*

¹ W *vyaveto* ² W B put this word after the cited rule ³ G M *vyaveto*

18 *visarjanīyādīnām varṇatvāviśeṣāt kārōttaratvam prāptam anena nnavartyate na khaḥ visarjanīyādīnām kārōttaratā bhavati kutah sarvatra*¹ *prayogānupalambhāt nanu yathā varṇaḥ kārōttaro varṇākhyā* (i 16) *iti varṇaḥ abaddavācyasyāi 'va kārōttaratvam nakāro nakāram* (vii 1 or xiii 6) *ity ādi na tu vācakasyāi 'va*² *anyathā varṇakāra ity syāt tadvad*³ *visarjanīyādīnām*⁴ *atrā*⁵ *'pi vācyagrahanam eva yuktam nā 'nyathā tathā sati vācakaparatayā vararucyādiviracitam*⁶ *udāharanam avasāne ravisarjanīya* (xiv 15) *ity ādy aruciram ity cet. māi 'vam mansthāh vācyānām*⁷ *kevalānām aprayogād atra vācyavācīkayor abhedavivakṣhayā sūtrasaraṇir ity udāharanagamanikā*⁸

¹ G M. ins. *tathā*. ² G M om *eva* ³ W. *tad*. ⁴ G M ins *ity* ⁵ W B *vara-*
rucāḥ, G M *vārarucāḥ* ⁶ W B *vācyādīnām* ⁷ W *-nam gam-*

goes on to raise and refute a very subtle and hair-splitting objection. In rule 16, he says, *kāra* is prescribed to be added not to the vocable (*vācaka*) *varna*, 'sound,' itself, but only to the thing designated (*vācya*) by that vocable, so likewise in this rule it is proper to understand by *visarjanīya* etc the things designated by those words, and nothing else (and hence, the rule must not be interpreted as implying that *visarjanīya* and the other names given are, in default of those formed with *kāra*, the accepted designations for the sounds in question). This being the case, the illustrations given under the rule by Vararuci and others—namely, rule xiv 15, speaking of *r* and "*visarjanīya*" as not liable to duplication—is an unsuitable one. Such is the objection. The reply is you must not think so, since the sounds designated by the terms in the rule are actually nowhere employed by themselves (as designations), the rule simply intends to include designation and thing designated in one expression, and the quoted example is proper enough.

एफस्तु रस्य ॥ ११ ॥

19 Of *r*, however, *epha* forms the name

That is to say, the technical designation of *r* is *repha*, *ra* being also admitted, by rule 21, below *rakāra* is not found anywhere in the Hindu grammatical literature. This peculiarity of treatment of *r*, as compared with the other consonants, is to be paralleled with the way in which it is written in consonant groups, almost as if a vowel.

The Vâj Pr has an equivalent rule (140)

The word *tu*, 'however,' in this rule, according to the commentator, is meant to deny the application to *r* of both the rules 16 and 17. Some, he says, hold that it denies only rule 17, or the insertion of *a* between *r* and the appended *kāra*, but this is wrong, for it would imply that the name of *r* was made sometimes by appending *kāra* and sometimes by appending *epha*, just as an alternation is in fact allowed by rule 21 below between *ra* and *repha*, and exemplified by rules vii 11 and xxi 15, while no

19 *rasya tv ephaçabda¹ ākhyā bhavati yathā rephoshma-
paraḥ² (xii 2) itī rephasya vyañjanatvadvijeshāt prāptam kārōt-
taratvam akāravyavetatvam ca tad ubhayaṁ tuçabdo nivāra-
yati anye tv anyathā manyante akāravyavetatvam eve³ 'ti. tad
asādhu tathā satī kadācid ephottaratā⁴ kadācit kārōttaratā ce 'ti
vikalpaḥ syāt yathā 'kārō vyañjanānām (121) itī vidhānād
vikalpaḥ tathā hi⁴ rephoshmasamyoge rephasvarabhak-
tiḥ⁵ (xxi 15) rashakpūrvo havanī (vii 11) ity ādi na tv evam
kārōttaratvam apī vikalpena⁶ svikrtam⁷ kutracet: tasmād asmad-
ukta eva yuktaḥ tuçabdārtthah*

¹ G M *reph-*, and M reads *rephas* in the rule itself ² W *-shmaçabda* ³ B *rephaksharata*, W *reph-* ⁴ W B 'pi ⁵ W B om ⁶ G M *naka* ⁷ G M *iah*

instance of a name formed with *kāra* is anywhere to be met with This is a very easy demolition of a very insignificant man of straw

ऋवो वर्णोत्तरस्त्रयाणाम् ॥ २० ॥

20 The short vowel, with *varna* after it, is the name of the three vowels

The "three vowels" referred to are the three quantities—short, long, and protracted—of the vowels *a*, *i*, *u*, respectively, *varna*, in this case, indicating only the 'color,' or phonetic complexion, of the vowel, without regard to its length The Ath Pr has the same usage of this term, but without defining it by rule As our treatise acknowledges no protracted *r*, and neither a long nor a protracted *l*, it does not admit the compounds *rvarna* and *lvarna* of the other three it frequently avails itself The instance selected by the commentator is rule x 4, which directs the combination of *a* with a following *i*, *i*, *i*s into *e*

अकारो व्यञ्जनानाम् ॥ २१ ॥

21 An *a* forms the names of consonants

This rule allows us to call a consonant not only, as prescribed in rules 16 and 17 above, by a name formed by adding *kāra* with *a* interposed, but also by one formed with *a* alone The commentator's example is rule v 22, where *t* and *c* are referred to as *ta-kāra*, *ca-kāra*, and *ç*, *c* again, and *ch*, as *ça*, *ca*, and *cha* If something merely additional to the *kāra*, instead of alternative with it, were intended in the rule, we are told, rule 17 would be made meaningless But, says an objector, why use *kāra* at all for the purpose, when even along with it the *a* has to be brought into requisition? let this alone furnish the name The reasonableness of the objection is conceded, but the commentator alleges as sufficient justification of the practice followed, that it is in accordance with that of the Çikshā and other text-books

He continues others assert that the *a* added to a consonant indicates (not that consonant pure and simple, but) a syllable composed of the consonant and any following vowel, as for instance in rule ix 3, "*visarjanīya* followed by *ksha* is not assimilated," where the examples are *manah ksheme* (v 2 1⁷), *ghanāghanah kshobhanah* (iv 6 4¹. so all the MSS, both here and under ix 3, my MS of the Sanhitā reads *kshobhanah*), and *ukthacāsah kshāma* (ii 6 12⁴) This is unsound, for then we should have to read *ishe tvā* (for *ishe tvā*, i 1 1, et al), by the rule vii 13, "after *vāghā* and *śha*, *t* becomes *t*," which is wrong Moreover, in the rule (xii.

20 *varnottaro hrasvo* ¹ *hrasvādirghaphlutānām ākhyā bhavati yathā vvarnapara ekāram* (x 4) *ity ādi varnapadda uttaro yasmād asdu varnottarah*

¹ G. M. ms. *trayānām*

4) “*ya, va, na, ha*, when followed by vowels,” the final specification would be useless, because already implied in the names given to the letters. Hence the opinion referred to is wrong, and the name taught by the rule indicates the consonant alone.

✓ As for the actual usage of the treatise, it is somewhat equally divided between the two modes of designation of the consonants, names formed with *a* alone occur nearly sixty times, with *akdra*, nearly eighty times. This is exclusive of *r*, which is called *ra* four times, *repha* fifteen times.

Compare rule 1.39 of the Vāj Pr

ग्रहणस्य च ॥ २२ ॥

22 As also, of a cited word

The term *grahana* is used in only two other rules of the Prāṭicākhya (1 24,50), but occurs in the commentary times innumerable, in the sense of ‘citation, word taken or extracted from the Sanhitā to be made the subject of some prescription’ (100 *grah*, ‘seize, take’). The commentator, however, gives it an artificial and false etymology, it denotes, he says, either a word respecting which something is to be enjoined (*lakshya*), or one which is the cause (*nimatta*) of an effect produced in some other word. The former is called *grahana* because it is “seized” (1 e “affected”), the latter, because something is “seized” or “affected” by it. It is, he continues, a part of a word, a theme or base. The *ca*, ‘also,’ of the rule brings forward, or indicates the continued implication of, the *a* of the preceding rule. The meaning is, then, that *a* forms the name of a citation, a theme, in whatever situation it may occur.

21 *vyāñjanānām akdra ākhyā bhavati yathā takāraṣ ca-kārañ¹ ṣacochaparah (v 22) ity ādi kārāḥabdottarātvam idam ca vihalpyate samuccaye tv akāravyaveto vyāñjanānām (1 17) iti vyartham syāt nanu tarhi kārottaratā² kimarthā³ tadānīm api svarāpenā⁴ ’kāalābhāt sa evā⁵ ’khyā bhavati satyam śikshādīḥāstraprasiddhasamketānusārene⁶ ’ti parihārah apare tu samgrante akdraḥ sarvasvarāntasya vyāñjanasya grāhaka iti yathā⁷ man----- ghan----- ukth----- ity ādi na kshaparah (ix 3) iti nishedhasyo ’dāharanam syād iti tad āśram kutaḥ⁸ v āghāshapūrvas tash tam (vii 13) iti shapārvatvāt⁹ takārasya tatve kṛte ish----- iti syāt tac cā ’nishtam, kim ca yavanahasvarapareśv¹⁰ (xii 4) iti atra svaraparaḥabdō vyarthah syāt bhavanmate sarvasvarāntasya¹¹ svikāranīyamāt tasindā anupapannam eva¹² tan matam manmahe kim tu varnamātrasyā ’khyā*

¹ W B omits these first two words of the rule ² G M -tvam ³ G M tham
⁴ G M avyavayam- ⁵ G M sarāya ⁶ W om ⁷ G M om ⁸ G M śhatvapū-
⁹ W yavanahaparasvar- ¹⁰ G M -ntamātrasya ¹¹ G M evā

That is to say, if a word be cited in the text of a rule by its theme-ending *a*, all its cases or other derivative forms are to be regarded as equally had in view by the rule. Reference is twice made to this principle hereafter by the commentator (under rules vi 13 and x 14), to justify such inclusions. The latter of the cases he here brings up, as example of a *nimitta*, or citation of an affecting cause, the cited word is *oshtha*, which is declared to occasion the loss of a preceding *a* or *ā* the only two instances of this combination which the Sanhitā contains are quoted in illustration, viz *svāh*" *oshthābhyām* (vi 3 16¹), and *upayāmam adharen*" *oshthena* (v 7 12). As example of a *lakshya*, or citation of a word to be determined by rule, he quotes the end of rule xvi 26, with its illustrative citations, *kiñçilāṣ caturthah* (v 5 9²), and *kiñçilāya cakshayanāya ca* (iv 5 9¹). This latter example is not very well chosen, as the case is a somewhat difficult and anomalous one (see the note on xvi 26).

• This rule, like some of those that follow, is of very small value, since final *a* is not the necessary sign of a cited theme in which other cases are included, and, on the other hand, parts of words not ending in *a* are often cited "for the sake of the inclusion of many words" (*bahūpādānārtham*)

ॐ, अकार आगमविकारिलोपिनाम् ॥ २३ ॥

• 23 *Ah* makes the name of an increment, or of an element suffering alteration or elision

Here, again, is a precept hardly called for, as the construction and connection of each rule shows in what way any nominative it contains is to be understood, without such an explanation as this, which applies only to a part of the cases, and is unable to teach us which of the three possibilities it contemplates is the actuality in any given case. Moreover, it is faultily expressed, and the commentator is obliged to explain that *ah* here stands for the ending of the nominative case, in the dual and plural as well as the singular. He quotes in illustration five rules xiv 5 exemplifies a singular increment, vii 1, a singular altered element, v 19, a singular elision, v 25, two-fold altered elements, xxi 12, plural increments

22 'lakshyam nimittam ca grahanam ity ucyate. grhyata² itī grahanan grhyata anene³ itī nimittam apī grahanam puḍā-kadeṣah prātipadikam itī yāvat cakārah pārvusātroktaṁ akāram ākarṣhati grahanasya prātipadikasya sarvāvasthasyā⁴ 'kāra' ākhyā bhavati yathā kiñçilakiñçilā (xvi 26) itī parakiñçilāṣabdo lakshyam udāharanam yathā kiñç- cat-...⁵ kiñç- caksh-... oshthevahparō lupyate (x 14) itī tu⁶ nimittam yathā svā-... upay-...

(1) W inserts this passage out of place, between rule 19 and its commentary

² G *grahanyata*. ³ G M omit this example ⁴ G M om

Rule 28, below, is very intimately connected with this, and the insertion of rules 25-27 between is quite unaccountable.

Rik Pr 1 14 includes the second of the three specifications here made, along with rule 28

ग्रहणं वा ॥ २४ ॥

24 Or the simple citation

The commentator says "Of these—namely the increment etc.—there is in some cases, alternatively, citation, the meaning is, without any *ah*" And he goes on to quote three rules, in which increment (xvi 29), alteration (vii 3), and elision (v 15) are taught otherwise than as prescribed in the preceding rule—which is not, however, thus amended into acceptableness

आसन्नं सदेहे ॥ २५ ॥ ✕

25 In case of doubt, citation is made of the next

This rule, occurring where it does, appears to have been interpolated by an afterthought, attaching itself to the word *grahanam*, 'citation,' of the preceding rule, without regard to the connection in which that word is used. The meaning is, that when the mere citation of a word from the *Sanhitâ* would leave a doubt as to which occurrence of the word is intended, some part of the context, a word or part of a word, is cited along with it. But the commentator's first example and its exposition are quite peculiar. He quotes *svayamâtrnnâm ca vikarnâm co 'ttame* (v 3 7^a), and remarks "There being a doubt, owing to the occurrence of two *ca*'s in this passage, which of them is to be taken to give the *pragraha*-character [to *uttame*], the one next to the proper subject of the rule [*kâryadhâ*], 'the word undergoing the prescribed

23 *âgamâdîndâm ahkâra âkhyâ bhavati ahkâra iti prathamâ vibhakter upalakshanam âgamasya yathâ 'dvitîyacaturthayoh tu vyañjanottarayoh pûrvah* (xiv 5) *vikârino yathâ atha nakâro nakâram* (vii 1) *lopinô yathâ tishthantyekayâ sapûrvah* (v 19) *ity ekavacanâni laparâdu lakâram* (v 25) *iti dvivacanam ânupûrvyân nâsikyâh* (xxi 12) *iti bahuvacanam âgamaç ca vikârî ca lopî câ "gama-vikârilopinah teshâm*

(1) B om

24 *teshâm âgamâdîndâm kvacid grahanam vâ bhavati ahkârena vinâ 'pi 'ti tâtpariyam âgamasya yathâ âdiraṇḥhatir* (xvi 29) *ity âdi vikarino yathâ hanyâdupyamânânam ca* (vii 3) *ity âdi lopino yathâ eshasasya* (v 15) *ity âdi*

¹ G M om *iti*

effect.] is to be assumed, in the rule reading *co 'ttame* [iv 11] " He seems to suppose that the "doubt" referred to in the rule concerns the point, which of the two preceding *ca*'s is joined with *uttame* in the precept that establishes the latter's character as a *pragraha* word, and that we need authority for understanding that the latter of the two is taken. This is little less than silly. His other example is taken from rule iv 15, where *ā prshatī* is made *pragraha*, the *ā* being the final letter of the preceding word *yuiṅd* (*yuiṅd prshatī*, iv 6 9⁴).

Under a later rule (iv 23) this principle is twice referred to, and very curiously and artificially applied. See the note to that rule.

५ अनेकस्यापि ॥ २६ ॥

26 Even of more than one

The genitive in this rule is grammatically inconsistent with the accusative of the one preceding, which I had to translate inaccurately in order to make the connection evident. The commentator declares the "even" (*api*) here to continue in force the word *samdehe*, 'in case of doubt,' which is hardly to be approved. He interprets "When there is ambiguity, citation is made of more than one word or sound," and quotes *tishtṭhantī ekayā* (v 19) and *evo 'ttare* (iv 11) as examples. But in these we have only one additional word cited, though more than one additional letter, so that both are properly examples under the preceding rule. There is no case, I believe, where more than one word requires to be cited along with that at which the rule aims, of a part of a word containing more than one letter we have instances in vi 2,5 etc. I see no good reason, however, why these should not be regarded as authorized by the preceding rule, and this one, accordingly, omitted as superfluous.

प्रथमो वर्गीत्तरो वर्गीय्या ॥ २७ ॥

27 A first mute, followed by the word "series," is the name of the series

25 *samdehe saty¹ āsanam² 'varnam padam³ vā grhṇīyāt svay-... ity atra cakāradvayasambhavāt pragrahanamittatvena katarasyo 'pādānum kartavyam iti samdehe yud³ āsanam lār-yabhāgas tad eva svikartavyam co 'ttame (iv.11) iti sūtre⁴ var-nasya yathā ā prshatī (iv 15) ity ādi*

¹ W om ² G M *padam varnam* ³ G M *yadā* ⁴ W B *sarvatra*

26 *samdeha anekasya padasya varnasya vā grahanam bhavati. apiṣadāḥ samdeha ity anvādṛṣṭi¹ yathā² tishtṭhantī ekayā sapūrvāḥ (v.19) evo 'ttare (iv.11) ity ādi*

¹ G M *ādiṣṭi* ² W B om ,

The commentator's example is rule xiv 20, "the *t*-series, followed by the *t*-series," that is to say, a lingual mute followed by a dental. Compare Vaj Pr 164

अं विकारस्य ॥ २८ ॥

28 *Am* makes the name of a product of alteration.

This is the correlative rule to 23, above, from which it has become strangely separated. The commentator explains, as before, that *am* stands here as representative of the accusative case in any number, but the two examples he gives (v 38 and vii 1) are both of them such as the rule might strictly apply to without any such extension of its meaning.

पूर्व इति पूर्वः ॥ २९ ॥

29 By preceding is meant preceding

A rule expressed in the form of an identical proposition cannot be claimed to cast much light of itself, but demands a comment as its essential part. Our commentator explains, "Whatever word is pointed out by the qualification 'preceding,' that word is to be understood as designated by its own form in that situation alone, but not, on account of identity of form, another word standing in a different situation. Thus, by the rules (iv 12,13) '*dyāvāprthivī* is *pragraha*, also the preceding word,' the word *yāvatī* is made a *pragraha* in the passage *yāvatī dyāvāprthivī mahatvā* (iii 2 6¹), but it is not therefore *pragraha* in the passage *yāvatī vā prthivī* (v 2 3¹)"

पर इत्युत्तरः ॥ ३० ॥

30 By following is meant succeeding

27 *vargaṣābdottarah prathamah svavargasyā* "khyā bhavati. *tavargaṣ ca tavargaparah* (xiv 20) *iti vargaṣābda uttaro yasmād asāu vargottarah*

¹ W om *sva*

28 *am iti ṣabdo vikārasya* "khyā bhavati. *am iti dvitīyāvibhakter upalakshanam yathā prathamapūrvō hakāraṣ caturtham* (v 38) *atha nakāro nakāram* (vii 1)

29 *yah pūrvāṣābdena nirdiṣṭah¹ sa tatrā² 'va svena rūpeno 'palakshito jñātavyah na tu rūpasāmānyād anyo bhinnadeṣasthah yathā³ dyāvāprthivī pūrvāṣ ca* (iv 12,13) *iti⁴ pragraho bhavati⁵ 'ti vakshyati pūrvatvād yāv-... iti yāvatīṣābdaḥ pragrahaḥ yāv-... iti tu⁶ na syāt pragrahaḥ.*

¹ G M *viśishyate* ² W om ³ G M om ⁴ G M *-vishyati* ⁵ G M. *atra.*

This is the counterpart of the preceding rule, and is explained by the commentator in corresponding terms. His illustration is taken from rules iv 49,50, where *dve* and the word following it are declared *pragraha*. In the passage, then, *dve jāye vndate* (vi 6 4³), *jāye* is *pragraha*, but not in the passage *yonir asī jāya e'ha* (i 7 9¹ & M omit *e'ha*)

The rule is only once referred to hereafter, namely under iv 52, and there for a purpose which it was not intended to answer

ऋकारल्कारौ ऋस्वौ ॥ ३१ ॥

31 *R* and *l* are short

As examples of short *r* and *l*, the commentator cites *rtavo vān* (vii.2 6¹), and *aklptasya klptyān* (v 4 8⁵)

अकारश्च ॥ ३२ ॥

32 Also *a*

"Also" (*ca*), says the commentator, brings forward the implication of "short" from the preceding rule. His example of short *a* is *ayam purah* (iv 3 2¹ or 4 3¹)

तेन च समानकालस्वरः ॥ ३३ ॥

33 Also any vowel having the same quantity with the latter

Here again, the "also" continues the implication of the predicate of rule 31, we are told. The only vowels contemplated by the rule, further, are *i* and *u*, since there is an absence of the attribute of like quantity with *a* in the diphthongs. As examples from the *Sanhitā* are quoted *iṣhe tvā* (i 1 1 et al), *upaprayanto adhvaram* i 5 5¹ or 7¹ W B omit *adhvaram*), and *atrā 'ha tad urugāyasya* (i.3 6² but see the various readings below). The commentator then raises the objection (without introducing it, as usual,

30 *yah para ity onena viśishyate so 'pi tatrān 'va svena rūpena pratyetaṇyāḥ yathā dve. paraś ca* (iv 49,50) *iti' pragraho bhavati 'ti vakshyati paratvād dve jā-... ity atra jāye iti'* *pragrahaḥ 'yo-... ity atra' na pragrahuḥ'*

¹ G M om ² G M ins *ṣaddah* ³ B om ⁴ G M ms. *tu*

31. *rādraś ca lādraś ca hrasvasamyñāu bhavataḥ yathā' rt-...: ak-...*

¹ W B om

32 *akāraś ca hrasvasamyñāo bhavati cakāro hrasvatvam' anu-ādikāṭi yathā: ay-... ity*

¹ G M. *evam*

with *nanu*), that the matter of the three rules should have been put into this form "A is short also any vowel having like quantity with it," because, as actually stated, they are liable to the reproach of saying the same thing over twice (since *r* and *l* are of the same quantity as *a*, and are therefore included in the prescription of the present rule) But he replies that the statement is right in its present shape, for *r* and *l* inhere in *r* and *l*, and one might therefore suppose that, being letters of more than one articulating position, they suffered an extension of quantity, and were not short hence the special rule concerning them The treatise, as was noticed above (under 1.2), nowhere describes the formation of *r* and *l*, though it excludes them from the category of simple vowels

The rule of the Vāṅ Pr (1.55) is nearly the same with this

अनुस्वारश्च ॥ ३४ ॥

34 Also *anusvāra* ¹

The implication being the same as in the preceding rules, *anusvāra* is here defined as having the quantity of a short vowel The commentator explains the occasion for the rule as follows. rule xxi 6, which teaches that *anusvāra* and *svarabhakti* are to be attached to the preceding vowel in syllabication, implies the consonantal character of the former, whence, by rule 37, below, it would have the quantity of a half-mora, and its true quantity of a mora requires special definition

The Vāṅ Pr (iv 147, 148) allows *anusvāra* to make with a preceding vowel, either long or short, two moras, oddly enough distributing the time between the two elements, vowel and nasal, in such a way that the latter has a mora and a half after a short vowel, the vowel being itself shortened to a half-mora, while after a long vowel the nasal is itself cut down to a half-mora, and a mora and a half are assigned to the vowel—a highly artificial ar-

. 33 tenā 'kārena yas tulyakālaṁ svarah sa' cā hrasvo bhavati
atrā' 'pi cakāro hrasvādeçakāḥ: kārā rēdāç cē' ty 'arthah:
samāhyaksharānām samānakālatvābhhāvāt yathā. ३३
up----- atr----- akāro hrasvas tena ca samānakālasya
ārabdhavyam rkārakārayoḥ hrasvāv iti tv' nā "rabdhavyam
evam ārabhyamāne punaḥ kṛtāyā gauravam bhaved iti ucyate
ārabdhavyam eva kutah. rkārakārayor antaḥ rephalakā
rāu stah: tatātseḥ anavācā ananyoh kālavayabhidhānā syāt: hras
vatvam na' gauravaḥ tan mā bhūd ity evam ārabhyate. rkārak
kāraṁ ३४

¹ G M tatrā. ² M. hrasvādeçakāḥ samānakālaḥ svarah sa' cā hrasvo bhavati
³ G M. kāsasvā. ⁴ W. om. ⁵ B atrā 'has only. G M. āra-ty; both as in
the introduction. ⁶ what follows ⁷ G M om ⁸ G M anantare ⁹ G M. tatrā
¹⁰ om. ¹¹ G M. anagamyate. ¹² G M. ins hrasvā

rangement The Rik Pr gives no special statement respecting the quantity of the nasal element, but leaves it to be included among the other consonants, which have half a mora of time each

All the "short" elements being now enumerated, the commentator quotes, as example of the employment of the term "short," rule III 1 As example of *anusvāra*, he quotes *tāñ haste* (VI 1 37)

द्विस्तावन्दीर्घः ॥ ३५ ॥

35 An element of twice that quantity is long

The literal meaning of this rule is, says the commentator, that one of the before-mentioned short vowels, when doubled, is long, but its virtual intent is that a vowel having twice the quantity of a short is long I have translated in accordance with the latter interpretation As example of the use of the term "long" is quoted rule x 2, respecting the coalescence of two similar simple vowels into the corresponding long vowel

त्रिः सुतः ॥ ३६ ॥

36 An element of three times that quantity is protracted

The commentator explains the virtual meaning of this rule in the same manner as that of the preceding, and quotes in illustration

34 *bhavaty anusvāraḥ ca¹ hrasvasamyñāḥ yathā tāñ---*
caḥaro hrasvānvākarśhakāḥ² anusvārah svarabhaktiḥ ca
(xxi 6) iti svarapratyañgatavidhānād³ anusvārasya vyañjana-
tvam tathā sati hrasvārdhakālam vyañjanam (137) ity
atrā⁴ 'rdhamātrātvam⁵ prāptam⁶ tan nā bhād iti hrasvatvam
vidhīyate hrasvasamyñāyāḥ prayojanam⁷ vibhāge hrasvam
vyañjanaparaḥ (III 1) iti

¹ G M *ap* ² G M *hrasvak* ³ MSS *svaram pr*, W *ngavidh-* ⁴ G M *om*
⁵ G M *-tve* ⁶ G M *-te*

35. *tāñ iti prakṛto hrasva ucyate dvur iti dvirūpāḥ¹ tāñ*
hrasvo dīrghasamyñō bhavati² 'ti sūtrayojanā tātparyam tu
hrasvadvigunakālah³ svaro dīrghasamyñō bhavati⁴ 'ti⁵ samyñāyāḥ
prayojanam dīrghaṇ samānāksṣare savarnapare (x 2)
ity ādi.

tion of the term "protracted" rule x 24, which directs that a protracted and a *pragraha* vowel are not liable to combination

All the treatises agree closely in their definitions of vowel quantity, see Ath Pr 1 59-62, and the notes upon those rules

ह्रस्वार्धकालं व्यञ्जनम् ॥ ३७ ॥

37 A consonant has half the quantity of a short vowel

This, the comment reminds us, is a rule defining the length of a consonant, not one giving the meaning of the term consonant. For, if it were the latter, the word "time" in rule xvii 5, which speaks of "the time of a consonant," would be open to the charge of redundancy. We hardly need so trifling and technical a proof of a thing so obvious. As example of a consonant, the word *vāk* (e g 1 3 9¹ but G M read instead *vā*) is given us.

Of the other treatises, the Ath Pr. (1 60) alone differs from this by giving to a consonant a whole mora as its quantity

उच्चैरुदात्तः ॥ ३८ ॥

38 A syllable uttered in a high tone is acute

The commentator enters into no explanation of the meaning of the definition of the acute tone or accent here given, but simply refers us to a later rule (xxii 9), where the action of the organs in producing the higher tone is more particularly described. He adds as example of an acute vowel *sa vdhānāh* (iv.4 4⁵, but all the MSS save W read *sā vti*), and quotes rule xiv, 29 as exemplifying the use of the term *udatta*, 'acute' (literally 'elevated'). I have explained in the note to Ath Pr 1 14-16 why I prefer, instead of transferring the terms *udatta*, *anudatta*, and *svarita*, to translate them by 'acute,' 'grave,' and 'circumflex,' respectively

नचिरनुदात्तः ॥ ३९ ॥

39 In a low tone, grave

37 *vyañjanam hrasvārdhakālam bhavati na tu vyañjanam iti samyñā anyathā¹ vyāñjanakālaḥ ca svarasyā 'trā. 'dhikah² (xvii 5) iti 'kālaḥ sabdasya pāṇaruktyāpatteh yathā vāk hrasvasyā 'rdho³ hrasvārdhak⁴ 'hrasvārdhakālah⁵ parimānam yasya⁶ tat tatho 'ktam.*

¹ G M. om. ² G M omit the last words of the rule ³ G M ins. *atra*. ⁴ G M *-dham* ⁵ G. M *hrasvārdhakālah parimānakālo yasya*—a good and consistent reading, B is corrupt. ⁶ *-lam*

38. *dyāmo dārūṇyam¹ (xxii 9) iti lakṣhanalakṣitah² svara udatta ucyate. yathā³ sāmānyāḥ prayojanam udāt-tāt paro 'nudattāḥ svaritam⁴ (xiv 29) iti.*

¹ G M *-ta*. ² G M *ity ān*

We are again referred to the rule in one of the last chapters (xxii.10) which defines the action of the organs in producing the lower tone. The example for the accent is *avadātām* (1 7 2² but G M read *avadātām*), of which, in *pada*-text, all the syllables are grave, that for the term *anudātā*, 'grave' (literally, 'not elevated'), is, in W B, rule iv 43, but in G M, rule xiv 29

समाहारः स्वरितः ॥ ४० ॥

40 Their combination is circumflex

The commentator explains *samāhāra*, 'combination,' as from *samāhriyate*, 'it is taken together, collected, combined,' and adds, "the accent arising from the mixing of those two is the circumflex (*svarita*)". This is a precept concerning the peculiar nature of the accent, its occurrence is taught further on, in one and another place" and he quotes not less than three of the rules (xiv 29, x 16, and xii 9) which teach under what circumstances the circumflex arises. His example of a circumflexed syllable is *tē 'bruvan* (iii 2 2³ et al.)

This rule is so far ambiguous that it does not tell us in what order the acute and grave tones are to be combined to produce the circumflex accent—whether acute and grave, or grave and acute, but we may perhaps assume that the treatise consciously intends them to be taken in the order in which they are defined by the two preceding rules.

All the authorities practically agree in their general definition of the three kinds of accent (see note to Ath Pr 114-16), and Pāṇini's rules (12 29-31) are precisely the same with those here given. As regards the details which form the subject of the following rules of our treatise, the accordance is not so perfect (see note to Ath Pr 117)

तस्यादिरुच्चैस्तरामुदात्तादनन्तरे यावदर्धं रुस्वस्य ॥ ४१ ॥

41 Of this circumflex, in case it immediately follows an

39 *unvavasargah* (xxii 10) *iti* 'sātralakṣhataḥ' svaro 'nudātā ucyate'. *yathā av- samyñāyāḥ prayojanam anudātto na nityam* (iv 43) *iti* ⁴

¹ W B om ² G M -ta. ³ B lakṣhyate ⁴ G M give xiv 29, and *ity āde*

40 *tayor udāttānudāttayor yāḥ samāhārah sa* 'svarita ucyate *yathā* 'tē----- *samāhriyuta iti samāhārah tayor melanayan- yasvarah* 'svarita' *ity arthah svaritasvarāpavādhir ayam. upa- rishtāt tu* 'tatratatra svarito lakṣhyate' *yathā* 'udāttāt paro 'nudāttaḥ svaritam (xiv 29) udāttayoḥ ca paro 'nudāt- tah svaritam (x 16): tasminn' anudātte' pūrva udāttah svaritam (xii 9) *ity āde*

¹ M om ² W -ra, B -nyah svara ³ G M om ⁴ G¹² M vak- ⁽⁵⁾ W om ⁶ W. *tannudātte*.

acute the first part, to the extent of half a short vowel, is uttered in a yet higher tone

That is, higher than the tone of acute, which properly forms its first element, one is tempted to give the word *udāttatī* a double construction, as belonging in idea to *uccāstarām* as well as to *anantare*

The subject of the more particular definition of the circumflex accent occupies the six following rules, and any comments upon the doctrines laid down will be better reserved until the last rule

As example of the circumflex, the commentator cites the words *sā idhānāḥ* (iv 4 4⁵), already once given (under rule 38), the first syllable of the second word has the enclitic circumflex, by rule xiv 29, under which the same quotation is repeated

उदात्तसमः शेषः ॥ ४२ ॥

42 The remainder has the same tone with acute

The plain meaning of this rule is distorted by the commentator, in an attempt to avoid a seeming inconsistency. He claims, namely, that the word "same with" here signifies "a trifle lower than," "because otherwise there would be no circumflex"—the circumflex having been defined in rule 40 as including both the higher and lower tone. But the inconsistency is not evaded by claiming for the last portion of the circumflex any thing short of the actual "grave" tone which rule 40 prescribes if, indeed, giving to its first portion a higher tone than "acute" be not an equal offense against the same rule

सव्यञ्जनोऽपि ॥ ४३ ॥

43 Along with the consonant, too

Says the commentator—"the rule as formerly given applied to a pure vowel, now the same thing is taught of the circumflexed vowel even in case of its combination with a consonant. The circumflexed vowel along with its consonant, either the one which directly follows an acute or another, is as defined. The 'too' (*api*) continues the implication of the circumflexed vowel." To this explanation of *api*, as simply equivalent with *ca*, we must demur. As any one may see by referring to the various rules in

41 *udāttād anantare yaḥ svarāḥ svaryate tasyā 'dā tāvad uccāstarām udāttatāro bhavati yāvad dhrasvayā 'rdham. ya-thā sā----*

42 *hrasvārdhahālāo chesha udāttasamo bhavati. 'na tā 'dātu eva samaśabdaprayogāt kimcānyānatvam pratiyate': anyathā svaritābhāvāt pūrvoktam evo 'dāharanam*

(⁵) W repeats these clauses in the comment of the preceding rule, after *bhavati*.

which it occurs, it is always best translated by 'even,' as pointing out something which is to a certain degree anomalous, or not to have been naturally expected

As examples of circumflexed syllables containing consonants, the commentary offers *sākhā sākhībhyo vārivah kṛnotu* (u 3 11¹ all the MSS except W give only the second and third words, which are the ones to which the rule applies, the second syllable of each has the enclitic *svārīta*, and they are to be read and divided *sā-khīb-bhyo vā-rī-vah*), and *tishyāh* (u 2 10² et al but G M omit this example)

I have not observed that any other of the treatises deems it necessary to lay down in terms the principle that the consonant shares in the accentuation of the vowel to which it is attached. Though the rule may be regarded as in a manner superfluous, it is less to be objected to in itself than on account of the place where it is thrust in, so wholly out of connection. It ought to be somewhere where it can be made to apply to all the three accents, and not to the circumflex alone

अनन्तरा वा नीचस्तराम् ॥ ४४ ॥

44 Or the part following is uttered in a lower tone

The comment explains *anantara* in this rule as equivalent to *gesha* (in rule 42), and paraphrases by saying that "the remainder of this circumflexed syllable, after the half-mora [of which the character was defined in rule 41], is in a lower tone, that is, is *anudāttatara* ('lower than grave')". Whether this is the true meaning, and not rather that the last part of the syllable, instead of being "of the same tone with acute" (rule 42), is "of lower tone (than acute)," may well be made a question. It would be, I should think, an exaggeration of the circumflex of which hardly any theorist would be guilty, to begin it higher than acute, and end it lower than grave. The latter of the two interpretations suggested is also (though not unequivocally) supported by the next rule, which may most naturally be regarded as letting down the concluding tone of the syllable one degree farther than the present rule, as this than the preceding

43 *kevalasyā 'yam vidhah purastād uktah idānim vyāñjanasahitātve 'pr 'svāritasya tathātvam ucyate. 'savyañjano 'pr 'svārīta 'udāttād anantaro' 'nyo 'vo 'ktavidhah' bhavati apīgabdhah' 'svāritam ākarshati' yathā sakhā.... ti-*

(¹) W om (²) W -ttānant- (³) W vā mukhyā v (⁴) B om (⁵) G M -tākar-shākah

44. *tasya svāritasya hrasvārdhakāḍāc chesho nīcāstarām anudāttataro' bhavati anantarah gesha ity arthah. tad evo 'dāharanam.*

¹ W dāttaro

अनुदात्तसमो वा ॥ ४५ ॥

45 Or in the same tone with grave

The commentator does not attempt this time, as under rule 42, to show that "same" means in reality "a little different," but simply paraphrases (taking no account of the *vā*, 'or') "That same remainder of this circumflexed syllable is the same with *anudātta*"

आदिरस्योदात्तसमः शेषो ऽनुदात्तसम इत्याचार्याः ॥ ४६ ॥

46 Its beginning is the same with acute, its remainder is the same with grave so say the teachers

Or, it may be, 'so says the teacher,' the plural being used in token of respect the word *ācārya* is not elsewhere found in the treatise (save at xxiv 6) except in the expression *ekeshām ācāryānām*, 'of certain teachers,' which occurs several times. The commentator does not give us his opinion upon the point, but he declares this to be the only rule that is approved or of force (*ishṭa*, literally 'desired') in the net-work (*jāla*) of alternative views here adduced, commencing with rule 41. It may, in fact, be looked upon as identical in meaning with the fundamental rule 40, and as presenting the only reasonable and sensible view of the true character belonging to the circumflex accent. The elaboration of the theory of the circumflex, the classification of its varieties, and the determination of their relations to one another, appear to have been quite a favorite weakness with the Hindu phonetists. The subject occupies the whole of one of the later chapters of this treatise (xx), together with sundry rules in other chapters; and a more detailed examination of it, and criticism of the views taken respecting it, will be necessary in connection with some of those rules.

While approving this rule, for the reason that it is in accordance with the last two rules of chapter xx, which define the relation of

45 *tasya*¹ *svartasya sa eva śeṣho 'nudāttasamo bhavati*

¹ G M om

46 *tasyān 'va svartasyā "dihrasvārdhakāla udāttasamo bhavati 'śeṣas tv anudāttasamo bhavati' śeṣas tv anudāttasamā ity ācāryā bruvate yathā sakḥ---- tasyā "dir (141) ity ādyaḥ śhite² 'smān vikalpajāle³ sūtram etad eve 'śṭam prapliṣṭapratīkatayor mrdutarah (xx 11) tāro vyāñjanapādavrttayor (xx 12) iti lakṣhaṇānukūlyāt na tā 'paritanam api sūtram iṣṭam etallakṣhaṇapratīkālyād eva*

⁽¹⁾ G M omit, which is better ² G M *ābhya* 'śhite, B *ābhyaṣṭa* (?—corrupt) ³ W B *-lpya-* (*lpya?*), W *jāte*

operation of iv 40 the *te* is in each case the ending of a dissyllabic word. What is meant by “enumeration” is not, in itself, very clear, as the case already cited is, in a certain sense, one of enumeration—namely, of the syllables of a word. The commentator shows its intent by pointing out that, by rules iv 49–51, the word *dve*, the next word to it, and the next but one, are made *pragraha* hence, in the passage *dve savane gukravati* (vi 1 6⁴), *gukravati* (*pada*-text *gukra-vati*) must be counted as a single word only, or the *i* of *vati* would not be *pragraha*.

In this, as in the Rik and Atharva Prātiçākhyas, the word *ingya* (T W B and O more usually write *ingya*, or *inya*) means a compound word, treated as separable into its constituents in the *pada*-text. The St Petersburg lexicon erroneously explains it as signifying a single member of such a compound.

Compare Rik Pr 1.25, and Vaj Pr 1 153

तस्य पूर्वपदमवग्रहः ॥ ४१ ॥

49 Of such a word, the former member is called *avagraha*

The example quoted is *devāyata it deva-yate* (iii 5 5³)—an instance of *carod*, or repetition with *iti* interposed, such as is usual in the *krama*-texts, and, to a certain extent, in the *pada*-texts also. The existing *pada*-texts of the Rik and Atharvan would write this word simply *deva-yate*, reserving the repetition with *iti* for words which are *pragraha* and separable at the same time but that of the Tāttirīya-Saṁhitā treats all separable compounds in the latter method (see, for the varying usages of different texts, the note to Ath Pr iv 74). In *deva-yate*, the part *deva* is denominated *avagraha*. As instance of the use of this technical term is given the rule (iv 2) which exempts all first members of compounds from the action of the rules prescribing *pragraha*.

The commentator, finally, calls attention to the mutual relation, or apposition, of the words *pada* and *avagraha* in the rule, each in its own gender (the former being neuter, the latter masculine) compare under ii 7 and v 2.

The other Prātiçākhyas use the term *avagraha* in this sense, but without taking the trouble to define it.

पदग्रहणेषु पदं गम्येत ॥ ५० ॥

50 In citations of a word, that word is to be understood

That is to say, the cited word itself, and not a part of a word

49 'tasye 'ṅgyapadasya pūrvapadam avagraha' ity ucyate yathā dev-.... avagrahasamjñāyāḥ² prayojanam nā 'va-grahaḥ (iv 2) ity ādi padāvagrahaśabdāyor nyatāhṅgatvā-nyonyānvayaḥ³ sambhavati

(1) G M om (2) G M om avagraha (3) W nyamal

identical in form with it. Thus (to take the commentator's example), *tve* is later (iv 10) declared *pragraha* except at the end of a separable word, as in the passage *tve kratum* (iii 5 10¹), the exception specified is necessary, because the *tve* of a word like *aditive* (p *aditi-tve*) is also a *pada* or vocable,—but it is not therefore to be inferred that the *tve* of *kratve*, in the passage *kratve dakshāya* (iii 2 5², 3 11⁴), is also *pragraha*.

As the commentator had formerly derived *grahanam* (i 22) from *grhyate*, so now he derives *grahanām* from *grhnanti*, 'they seize, take'.

The principle here taught is appealed to several times (under iv 11, 38, vii 2) hereafter, in order to the settlement of doubtful points.

It would seem possible to be still made a question whether the citation in any particular rule were a *pada*, 'a full word,' or a *padāṅkadeśa*, 'part of a word,' since citations of the latter kind are also frequently made. Perhaps the commentator would settle the difficulty by asserting that no combination of articulate sounds which actually occurs in the *Sanhitā* as a *pada* is ever cited in any other character.

अपि विकृतम् ॥ ५१ ॥

51 But that word, even when phonetically altered

The commentator gives two examples. The word *vāhana*, he says, is cited later (vii 6) as one whose *n* is liable to conversion into *n* this conversion, then, still holds good, though the final syllable of the word have become *o* thus, *pravāhano vahnah* (i 3 3). Again, *syah*, by v 15, loses its final *visarga*, and it does so, even when its *s* is changed to *sh*, as in *ayam u shya prī devayuh* (iii 5.11¹). As regards the former of these examples, it might seem to be provided for by rule i 22, above—but the commentator would doubtless plead that the rule would apply to *vāhanah*, but not to *vāhano*.

50 *padagrahaneshu sūtreṣu grhitam padam eva gamyeta* ¹
jñātavyam na padāṅkadeśaḥ yathā *tve ity anirṅgyāntaḥ* ²
(iv 10) *iti vakshyati. tathā sate tve----* *iti pragraho bhavati*
kra----- *iti padāṅkadeśān* ⁴ *na bhavati grhnanti* ³ *iti grahanām*
padānām grahanām padagrahanām teshu

¹ M ms *tad* ² G M -*gam* ³ W *anirṅgy-*, B *anirṅgy* ⁴ G M -*ratvān*

51 *apṛcchādāḥ padam anvādīṣate. padagrahaneshu vikṛtam*
api padam avagantavyam yathā. natvāpattāu vāhana (vii 6)
iti grahīṣyate padam iti kṛtvā visarjanīya oṭrum āpanne ¹ *prī*
natvam nā ² *'vu nīvartate. pra-----: eśhasasyah* (v 15) *iti*
visarjanīyalopagrahanam pathīṣyate ay----- ity atra sakāre
śatvam āpanne ¹ *visargulopo bhavaty eva*

¹ G M ms *prī*

अप्यकारादि ॥ ५२ ॥

52 And even when preceded by *a*

The evident occasion of this rule is the frequent occurrence of words with the negative prefix *a* attached to them. But, it being once established, its sphere is not restricted to that class of compounds, as is shown in the very example chosen by the commentator to illustrate its working. By *iii 2*, *çvā* is included among the words whose final *ā* is liable to be shortened, then, by this rule, *açvā* is also included e.g. *açvāvantāñ* (p. *açva-vantāñ*) *sa-hasrinam* (*iii 3 11*¹).

Application of this principle is quite frequently made below (under *iii 2,8*, *v 13,16*, *vi 5,14*, *viii 8,13*, *xi 16*, *xvi 6,19*)

अन्कारादि च ॥ ५३ ॥

53 And when preceded by *an*

The origin and aim of this rule are obviously the same with those of the preceding, but the instances of its application are less frequent. It is appealed to but three times in the sequel (under rules *iii 7*, *viii 8*, and *xvi 29*). The last case is the one selected by the commentator as his example. The word *añçu*, by *xvi 29*, contains *anusvāra*, hence the same word preceded by *an* is to be regarded as included with it, as in the passage *anañçu kurvantañ* (*iii 2 2*¹).

The commentator now raises the question how comes *lāra* to

52 *atrā 'py apīçabāñ padānvādeçakāñ padagrahaneshv akārādī¹ apī² padam vyñeyam 'çvartāvayunā* (*iii 2*) *iti hrasvādege vakshyati akārāder api tasya grahanasya hrasva-tvam bhavati yathā açv----- akāra ādir yasya tat tathoktani*

¹ G M *āç* ² G M *ca* ³ G M prefixes the preceding three words of the cited rule

53 *caakārah padam iti bodhayati padagrahaneshv anākārādī¹ api padam vyñeyam añçu* (*xvi 29*) *ity anusvārāgume vakshyati ankārāder api tasyā 'nusvārāgamah syāt yathā an----- ankāra ādir yasya tat tathoktam*

nanv atra sūtre 'n ity asya lārottaratvam katham kriyate varnāñ kārottarāñ ah (*i 16*) *iti 'sūtre varnasya² lārottaratvavdhānabhañgaprasañgāt ucyate satyam³ etacchāstrabalāñ 'na kriyate kun tu çāstrāntarabalāt⁴ kriyate yathā. pāñnīyā⁵ 'evakāra apikāra⁶ ityāññām sādhitvani kathayanti evam atrā 'pi evam ahkāra āgama* (*i 23*) *ity atra⁷ codyuparihārāñ vyñeyāñ*

⁽¹⁾ G M *varnaçabāñasya*, ⁽²⁾ G M *tasya* ⁽³⁾ B om ⁽⁴⁾ G M *evakāre 'pi* ⁽⁵⁾ G M *atrā 'pi*

be added here to the syllable *an* ² since offense is thus committed against the precept in rule 16, above, that *kāra* is added to an alphabetic sound to form its name. His answer is true enough that it is not done by authority of this text-book, but it is done by the authority of other text-books, for example, Pāṇini's followers establish the propriety of such expressions as *evakāra*, *aprikāra* (for the words *eva* and *api*). So likewise in this very treatise (in rule 23, above) we have *ahkāra* for *ah*, and the same objection and answer are to be understood as applying there. See the note under rule 16.

एकवर्णः पदमपक्तः ॥ ५४ ॥

54 A single sound composing a word is called *aprakta*

The commentator explains *ekavarnah* after the fashion usual with him in treating a *karmadhārayu* or determinative compound "that is both single (*eka*) and a sound (*varna*), hence, a single sound." The term *aprakta* means, he says, 'uncombined with a consonant'. As example of an *aprakta* word, he quotes *sa uv ekaviṣṭavartanah* (iv 3 3²), where *uv* is, by rule ix 16, representative of the particle *u*, and, as counter-example, to illustrate the force of the specification "composing a word," *yagnāpatāḥv iti* (vi 6 2³), where *v*, though in a manner isolated, is not *aprakta*, being only a fragment of a word. Rule ix 16 exemplifies the use of the term.

आद्यन्तवच्च ॥ ५५ ॥

55 And is treated both as initial and as final

As an instance of the treatment of an *aprakta* word as initial, the commentary again cites the passage *sa uv ekaviṣṭavartanah* (iv 3 3²), and declares that in it is to be seen the effect of rule 41, above (G M have here a *lacuna*, and omit the reference to the rule, along with the other instance). This is quite unintelligible to me, since

54 *ekaṣ cā 'sau varnaṣ cār* ¹ *'kavarnah sa cet padam bhavati so 'prktah* ² *syāt yathā sa----* *padam iti kin yaj----* *sam-jñāyāh prayojanam. ukāro 'prktah prakṛtyā* ³ (ix 16) *iti aprakta iti vyākhyānenā 'samnyuta* ⁴ *ity arthah*

¹ B *uṣ sa* ² G M *ktasamyā* ³ G M add the remaining two words of the cited rule ⁴ G M *yukta*

55 *cakārānvādīṣṭam tad aprktasamyānam padam ādyantavoc* ¹ *ca kāryabhāḥ bhavati ādivad yathā sa----* *ity atra 'tasyā* ² *"āir uccāṣṭarām* (i 41) *iti kāryam bhavati antavād yathā o te----* *ity atra* ³ *'ntah* (iv 3) *iti pragrahakāryam* ⁴ *bhavati ādiṣ cā 'ntaṣ cā "dyantāu tāv evā "dyantavat*

¹ G M *ādivad ant-* ² G M *om* ³ G M *-ho*

the rule referred to teaches nothing whatever that is characteristic of an initial sound—indeed, teaches no *kāryam*, ‘effect,’ at all. For the treatment of such a word as a final, we have as an example the passage *o te yanti* (1 1 33), in which *o* is *pragraha*, with reference to rule iv 3, which teaches that only a final vowel is *pragraha*.

With this rule and the preceding compare V.4 Pr 1 151–2, which are nearly identical with them in form and meaning. The Rik Pr does not define the term *aprakta*, but gives respecting it a rule corresponding with the present one. Both give in illustration the same passage, *indre*”’*hi* (*indra ā hi*), analogous with the one (*bhakshe*”’*hi*, in 2 5¹) quoted below, under v 3.

वर्णस्य विकारलोपो ॥ ५६ ॥

56 Alteration and omission are of a single sound

That is to say, not of a whole word. Where, as by v 19, more than one letter is omitted, each is specified. The cited examples are, of alteration, *dhvārshāhū* (1 2 8² by rule v 10), of omission, *sa te jānāti* (1 2 14^{2 3} by rule v 15).

I find this rule expressly appealed to but once in the sequel (under ix 7).

विनाशो लोपः ॥ ५७ ॥

57 Omission is complete loss

As example of *lopa*, ‘omission,’ the commentator quotes the passage *sa im’andā suprayasaḥ* (iv 1 8^{1 2}), where the initial *m* of *mandā* is lost after *im* (by rule v 12 see the note there given). As example of the use of the term, he gives rule v 11, which is introductory to the subject of omissions. He then proceeds to state a very curious reason why such a precept as this should seem called for: “some have maintained the eternity of sound in order to the confutation of that doctrine, this rule hath been uttered, in conformity with general grammar.” Panini’s corresponding precept (1 1 60) is *adarcanam lopah*, ‘omission is disappearance from view’.

56 *varnamātrasya vikāralopāu syātām na tu sarvasya padasya vikāras tāvāt dhā- uti ‘lopaḥ tu’ sa....*

(1) W om B omits this whole comment, along with the following rule

57 *varnavināṣo¹ lopasamyāno bhavati yathā sa.... sam-jñāyāḥ prayojanam atha lopah (v 11) ity ādi varnasya nityatām kecid āhuḥ tannirāharanāya vyākaranānusāreṇa sūtram etad abhāvaḥ*

¹ G M *varnasya v*

अन्वदेशो ऽत्यस्य ॥५८॥

58 Continued implication is of that which was last

The term *anvādeṣa*, 'after-indication,' with its corresponding verbal forms, and other equivalent expressions (especially *anvāharshaka*, *ākharshaka*, etc.), is constantly employed in the commentary to signify the continued force in a given rule of some specification made in a preceding rule. And the simple meaning of the present precept appears to be, that such a bringing forward is of the predicate last used, the word last cited, or the like. The commentator's first example is entirely accordant with this understanding in rule vii 3, namely, to the effect that the *n* of *hanyāt* and *upyamānam* is changed to *n̄*, the implication is "after *n̄h*," *n̄h* being the last mentioned in a list of altering words given in the preceding rule. But he goes on to make another application of the precept rule xv 8 says, "*a*, however, even in *samhātā* [is protracted and nasalized]," and it is to be understood that only a "last" or "final" *a* is intended—as in *suṣlokañs* (1 8 16²), protracted from *suṣloka*, while in *brahmāṣṇ tvañ rājan* (1 8 16^{1,2}), *agnāś ity āha* (vi 5 8⁴), *vicitryāś somāś na vicitryāś iti* (vi 1 9¹), where the words protracted are *brahman*, *agne*, *somāś*, and *vicitryāś*, and the *a* is not a final, there is no nasalization. Evidently, this is a wholly forced and false interpretation. No rule can mean two things so utterly different. Compare the notes to iv 3 and xv 8, where the principle is appealed to.

The comment seeks a kind of support for its double interpretation by calling attention to the distinction between an "affecting cause" (*numitta*), like the *n̄h* brought forward from vii 2 to vii 3 in the first example, and an "affected" word or element (*numittin*, 'having a cause'), such as is concerned in the second example. The latter (nearly synonymous with *lakṣhya*, used in the comment to 1 22) he defines as "something original (? *pradhāna* seems to be taken here in the sense of *prakṛti*) suffering a prescribed effect."

No one of the other Prātiçākhyas attempts to lay down any rules as to the *anvādeṣa* (or *anuvṛtti*), and its usages are, in fact, wholly irreducible to rule—a circumstance which involves the condemnation of the *sūtra* style of composition, because the *sūtras* are not and cannot be self-explanatory, or intelligible without an authoritative comment.

58 *numittasya numittino vā 'ntyasyā 'nvādeṣo bhavati numitti 'ti pradhānam¹ kāryabhāg ity yāvat numittasya yathā hanyād upyamānam ca (vii 3) ity asyā 'tra² n̄hṣabdasya numittino yathā akāras tu sañhitāyām api (xv 8) ity atra suṣlokañs³ ity antyasyā 'kārasya antyasye 'ti kim brah----*
ag----- vic-----

¹ W -nam, G M -na ² G M om ³ B om all the signs of protraction

उपबन्धस्तु देशाय नित्यम् ॥ ५१ ॥

59 An *upabandha*, however, is for that particular passage, and of constant effect

The commentator etymologizes *upabandha*, 'connection, tie,' as representing the meaning *upabādhyate*, 'it is tied up, bound to,' and he farther defines it as signifying a passage pointed out by the indication "in that," and one which is designated by an enumeration—referring to rules iv 22, 23, 48, 52 as examples. An *upabandha*, then, is a connected part of the *Sanhitā*, pointed out and defined by the rules of the *Prāṭīśākhya* in various ways by citing the first words of a single verse (iv 20) or of an *anuvāha* (iv 25, 48, xi 3), by the accepted title of a number of *anuvāhas*, either succeeding one another or otherwise (ii 9, 11, iv 52, ix 20, xi 3), by giving the first and last words of a passage (iv 22, 23), or by fixing a limit within a certain number of words from a specified word (iv 52). Respecting such a passage, we are told, this rule is intended to teach two things: first, that what is prescribed for it does not hold good in other passages—this is signified by the word *tu*, 'however,' in the rule,—second, that an exception which applies in other passages does not apply in it—this is signified by the word *nityam*, 'constantly, in all cases.'

Both prescriptions, as thus stated, the commentator undertakes to illustrate by quoted cases of their application. But his first illustration is imperfectly and obscurely set forth, and is, besides, of a very questionable character. He tells us that the passage *ity āha devī hy eṣā devaḥ somah* (vi 1 77) is brought, by the principle laid down in the next rule but one (i 61), under the action of rule iv 25—and this is all that he deigns to say about it. The meaning is this: the passage quoted contains a series of four words, *ity āha devī hi*, which are also found at ii 6 7⁵ (*devī devaputre ity āha devī hy ete devaputre*), and, as the *i* of *devī* in the latter passage is *pragraha* by iv 25, so, under the operation of i 61, it should be *pragraha* also in the other. Such, however, is not the case, for *devī* in *devī hy eṣā* is singular, while in *devī hy ete* it is dual. It would seem, then, as if we ought to understand the commenta-

59 *upabandhas tu svadeśāyān 'va nityam nirdeśuko bhavati ' upabādhyata' ity upabandhaḥ etasminn ity' adhikaranārūpaḥ samkhyānaviśayaḥ ca pradēśo upabandha ity ucyate. yathā irāvatī (iv 22) ity āha sūtradvayam somāya svar 'tasmin (iv 48) gamayato bhavataḥ (iv 52) iti ca upabandhe yad uktam tad anyatra na bhavati 'ti tuṣabddārthaḥ'. yathā ity.... atra tripadaprabhrtinyāyena (i 61) pūrvajaprabhrti ā'yam (iv 25) iti prāptih anyatra yo nishedhaḥ sa upabandhe na bhavati 'ti nityagabddārthaḥ yathā sadohavirdhāne (iv 11) iti pragraho grahishyate kevalāhavirdhāna' iti saṅgathā'*

tor to maintain that the present rule annuls the application of i 61 and, through it, of iv 25, to the case in question. But this is wholly inadmissible. For rule 61, below, is directly intended as a limitation to the present one, and has no force or value except as it applies to just such passages as the one here instanced, and with the latter are closely analogous a part of the examples adduced for its illustration, and leading to an opposite conclusion to the one here apparently arrived at. I cannot account for the way in which the commentator treats the matter. So far as I can see, *deri* at vi 1 77 is *pragraha* according to the rules of the Pratiśākhya, and has only by some oversight escaped being specially excepted. And the first restriction is of a general character, meaning that directions given for an *upabandha* passage are intended for that passage alone, and have no wider bearing—except as they receive it from i 61. The same, as will be seen below, limits also the other restriction, that expressed by *nyāyam*.

Further, the citation in rule iv 11 of the compound *śatohavirdhāne* as *pragraha* implies that the simple word *havirdhāne* would always be of a contrary character, as it in fact is in the passage *havirdhāne khyāyante* (vi 2 11¹), but this implication does not hold in the passage *havirdhāne prāci pravartayate* (iii 1 3¹), because of the inclusion of the latter among the *upabandhas* of rule iv 52. Here, however, is brought up an objection the explanation given is not satisfactory, because an exception made elsewhere is sometimes of force also in an *upabandha* passage. For instance, in the passage *atha mithunī bhavatah* (vi 5 8⁶), the word *mithunī*, which would else be *pragraha* by iv 52, is made otherwise by iv 53. Again, an example of a similar class is afforded by *vāyava śiṣhanavāhān* (v 6 21), where *vāyave* ought to be *pragraha*, because occurring in the *anuvāha* to which iv 48 refers, while it is deprived of that character by iv 54. The answer is made, that in the case of *grāmī*, *vāyave*, *manave* and the like, the exception must be allowed to have force because those words are excepted by specific mention, while the exception of *havirdhāne* is inferential only, and therefore does not hold good. Specific mention being of more force than mere inference.

na pragraho grhyate yathā⁷ hav----- ity ayam atra⁸ nishedhah hav----- ity atra na prasarati gamayato bhavatah (iv 52) ity ādinā prāptih nanv etad anupapannam anyatra nishedhasya hracid upabandhe 'pi darṣanāt yathā atha----- ity atra gamayato bhavatah (iv 52) ity upabandhaprāptiḥ na grāmī (iv 53) ity ādinā 'nyatra⁹ nishedhena nishedhyate tathā¹⁰ vāy----- ity atra somāya sva (iv 48) iti prāptir ate samānapada (iv 54) ity anenā 'nyatra nishedhena nishedhyate. * atro 'cyate grāmī vāyave manava ity ādinām kanthoktatrād esha nishedhah prasaratu¹¹ kevalahavirdhāne¹² pragraho¹³ ne 'ty ārtihko nishedho na prasaraty eva ārtihakanthoktayoh kan-

But this suggests a further objection why then is not the specific mention of *ate* and *ave* in rule iv 54 enough, and what is the use of adding the word *nityam*, 'in all cases,' in that rule? This, replies the commentator, is for the purpose of making the exception yet more strongly binding the specific mention merely annuls the application of the *upabandha* rule, the addition of *nityam* avoids the application of any other rule. For example, in *dve jāye vindate* (vi 6 4³), *vindate* should be *pragraha* (by rule iv 51), because separated by only one word from *dve*, and in *vanaspate vidvāṅ-gah* (iv 6 6⁵), the same character would belong to *vanaspate* (by iv 38) because followed by *vid*—and we are left to infer that the *nityam* renders rule iv 54 capable of reaching these passages, and taking away the *pragraha* character of the two words in question. This, adds the commentator, may be still further pursued, it has been thus drawn out in accordance with the view of Māhīsheya.

In all this exposition is to be seen something of the artificial and hair-splitting character which is apt to belong to a Hindu comment, while upon the whole it is sound and to the point. The term *upabandha* is doubtless better understood actively, as representing *teno 'pabādhyate*, 'that whereby there is binding up' the presence of *deśāya* in the rule is hardly reconcilable with the other interpretation. The intent of the specification *nityam* is to exclude general exceptions, made in view of other passages, or of the text at large, but not at all to deny the possibility of exceptions made expressly for the *upabandha* passages and such are iv 53 and others, referred to by the objector, and refuted by an inapplicable special pleading. The force which the commentator ascribes to the *tu* of the rule belongs rather to *deśāya*, and the *tu* has the value of a general disjunctive, bringing in a precept not connected with what has gone before.

Any additional instances of the application of the principles here laid down I have not searched for or chanced upon. The rule is appealed to but once in the sequel (under iv 54).

नानापदीयं च निमित्तं प्रग्रहसादिषु ॥ ६० ॥

60 Also a cause belonging to another word, in the case of a *pragraha* or of a word containing *anusvāra*

thoktasya prābalyāt nanv ate ave (iv 54) *ity anyoh kanthok-*
tyā 'vā lam tatra nityagrahanena kim ucyate nitarām par-
hārah kanthoktir upabandhaprāptim eva nivartayati nitya-
śubdas tu prāptyantaram api pariharati, yathā. dve---- ity atra
ekavyaveto 'pi (iv 51) *iti prāptih van---- iti* ¹⁴ *vīd* (iv.38)
ādiprāptih. evam ādy ūhanīyam ¹⁵ *māhīsheyamātānusārenar*
am prapañcitam

¹ B *upabādhyata* ² W *itya* ³ G M om *tu* ⁴ W B om ⁵ G M *kevalam*
hav- ⁶ G M *sarvadā* ⁷ W om ⁸ G M *anyatra* ⁹ G M om ¹⁰ G M *ya*
ihā ¹¹ G M *ratī* ¹² B *kevalam h-* ¹³ W *-he* ¹⁴ G M ms. *atra* ¹⁵ G M
-nyamam

The intent of this rule is made sufficiently clear by the commentator, but he is unable to show satisfactorily its connection, or the implication in virtue of which it comes to mean what it does. He puts, however, a bold face upon it, and declares that the *ca*, 'also,' implies the negative (*nañ* compare Panini 11 2 6 etc.) meaning signified by *tu* (that is to say, the *tu* of the preceding rule). This is quite unintelligible. More defensible would be the continuance of *nityam*, 'constantly' this, indeed, I conceive to be the real interpretation of the *ca*, although the rule is even thus left insufficiently explained by its context. The term *srādishu* points us to the sixteenth chapter, where is to be found an enumeration of all the cases in the *Sanhitā* exhibiting an *anusvāra* which is not a consequence of the phonetic rules of the treatise—of all the words which in their *pada* form contain an *anusvāra*—and this enumeration is led off (xvi 2) with the syllable *sra*. Many of this class of words are pointed out, as elsewhere in the *Pratīkāhya*, by mentioning the words which they precede or follow, which latter, then, become in the view of the treatise their *nimitta*, or 'cause' (taking the *post hoc* or *ante hoc* for a *propter hoc*). Inasmuch, now, as the *pragraha* quality and the occurrence of this *anusvāra* belong to the word itself, independently of its surroundings, it becomes necessary to teach that, when a word has been defined by means of its surroundings as thus characterized, it retains its character even when separated from them, as it is in the *pada*-text. Or, in the language of the rule, the defined occasion of a *pragraha* or of a constituent *anusvāra* is of force, even when it is, or is in, another *pada*.

The commentator, in illustration of the action of the rule, refers us first to iv 28, where *ghñi* and *cakre* are declared *pragraha* when immediately followed by *p*, these words are *pragraha* also in the *pada*-text of the same passages, when there is a pause between them and the *p*. Again, he quotes rule xvi 11, where *mā* is declared to have no *anusvāra* after it when preceded by an *avagraha*, that is, when it begins the second member of a compound, as in *ardhamāse devāh* (11 5 6⁶) here, too, the precept holds when

60 *cakāras tuṣubdanigaditam*¹ *nañartham anvādigati* *pragraheshu srādishu ca nānāpadasambandhi*² *nimittam asamhitāyām api svakāryam*³ *upadiṣati* *ti pragrahānusvārakāryam*⁴ *na nīvartate yathā vakshyati ghñi cakre papare* (iv 28) *pragrahāu bhavata iti utra pragrahatve papareno*⁵ *padishte pada-kāle*⁶ *tathā* *'va srādishu ca'* *yathā nā* *'vagrahapūrvah* (xvi 11) *ity avagrahenā* *'nusvārāgame nīśiddhe pada-kāle* *'pr tathā* *'na yathā*⁷ *ardh-----* *śatvamatvāddu*⁸ *tu nānāpadīyam*¹⁰ *nimittam samhatāyām eva kāryam karoti* *'ty ayam ārambhah yathā*¹¹ *śuc-----* *prāv-----*

¹ G M -*bdena n-* ² G M -*āha* ³ G M *svak* ⁴ W *sarak*, B -*hamusvak-*
⁵ G M *pakārena* ⁶ G M ins *'pr* ⁷ G M om ⁸ W om ⁹ G M ins *ca*
¹⁰ G M, *ya* ¹¹ W om.

the *avagraha* pause intervenes between the two parts of the compound as, *ardha-māse*. On the other hand, the cause (*numitta*) of alteration of a sibilant or nasal, if in a different *pada* from the letter it affects, is efficient only in *saṃhitā* for example, *gucishad* *iti guci-sat* (iv 2 1⁵), and *pravāhana* *iti pra-vāhanah* (1 3 3) and this is the occasion of the rule

I see no reason why this rule does not need to apply also to the cases of an original lingual nasal (*n*) enumerated in the thirteenth chapter

यथाक्तं पुनरुक्तं त्रिपदप्रभृति त्रिपदप्रभृति ॥ ६१ ॥

61 A repeated passage, of three or more words, is as already established

That is to say, the reading of any connected passage is as established by the rules for the first place where it occurs if repeated in a later part of the *Sanhitā*, where other rules, there applicable, would change its reading, it is exempted from their influence

Several examples are given in illustration by the commentator In the third chapter (*pragña*) of the first book (*kānda*) of the *Sanhitā* occurs the phrase *devasya tvā savituh prasave 'cvinoh* (1 3 1¹) but the same phrase is found also twice before, at 1 1 4², 6), and the initial *a* of its last word is cut off by the general rule xi 1, hence, when it occurs again in a *vājapeya* passage (namely at 1 7 10³), where, by xi 3, the elision of the *a* is forbidden, the effect of the latter rule is suspended, and the passage reads as before. Again, the words *supathā rāye asmān* are first found at 1 1 14³, where, as the *anuvāka* is a *yāgyā*, the *a* of *asmān* remains unelided by xi 3, and when they occur again at 1 4 43¹, that letter still maintains its place. Once more, the phrase *sa jāto garbho asī rodasyoh* is read at iv 1 4², and again at v 1 5³ 4, the former time in an *ukhya* passage, where the *a* of *asī* is retained by xi 3, and it is therefore retained in the other passage also

The commentator applies to the rule the restriction that in the repeated passage the word respecting whose form there is question must hold the third place (that is to say, doubtless, that it must have not less than two other words before it). In support of this limitation, he cites a case at iv 2 8², in an *ukhya* passage, occur

61 trayānām padānām samāhāras tripadam kāryaubhājah padasya trītyatvam vyñēyam idr̥cam tripadam tat' prabhr̥ty ādir̥ yasya tat' tripadaprabhr̥ti yathoktam pārvoktam vidhimi karoti svaviśeshanam² yatra³ tripadaprabhr̥ti punaruktam cet tathā⁴ lupyate tv akāra ekārāukārapārvah (xi 1) ity anena prathamakāṇḍatrītyapragñe dev---- ity atrā 'kāre hūpte tad eva vākyam vājapeye 'py ulopam bādhitvā tathā⁵ va bhavati. tripadaprabhr̥tītvāt ubhā vām (1 1 14¹) ity atra sup---- ity etad ud u tyam jātavedasam (1 4 43¹) ity atrā 'pi tathā

the words *prthvīm annu ye antarikṣhe ye divi tebhyaḥ* (W B omit the first two words of the citation), and the *a* of *antarikṣhe* is left unelided by x1 3, but at iv 5 11² (in the last *annuāka* of the chapter called *rudra* see rule x1 3) we read *ye pṛthivyām ye 'ntarikṣhe ye divi* (W B, again, omit the first two words quoted, and also give *ye ant-*)—which, but for his restriction, would be a violation of the rule. I cannot but question, however, the right of the commentator thus to limit the rule, for I have noted at least three cases where, if it be admitted, the retention of an initial *a* in a repeated passage would be left without authority: they are *pāvako asmabhyam* (v 4 4⁵ and iv 6 1^{3,5}), *predhō agne* (v 4 7³ and iv 6 5⁴), and *dadhikrāvo akūṣhaḥ* (v 11 4 19⁴ and i 5 11⁴). Whether there are other cases like that to which the commentator appeals, I am unable to say: but I cannot help suspecting that he devised this modification of the rule to suit that particular passage, without sufficient regard to what might be required by other parts of the text.

But he is guilty of another piece of arbitrary interpretation which is still more unjustifiable, and which he makes yet lame work of defending. The term *tripaḍapi abhūti* means, according to him, a series of words beginning with three words of which the third is the one whose form is in question—that is to say, a series of at least four words, of which one follows the word of doubtful reading. The case to which he appeals to establish this is as follows: the words *divas pari prathamam jagñe agniḥ asmat* (W B omit *asmat*) occur at i 3 14⁴, in a *yājñā* passage, where *agniḥ* keeps its initial vowel by x1 3, again, the words *itah prathamam jagñe agniḥ* are found at ii 2 4⁵: there seems to be a repetition, and a reading of *agniḥ* founded upon it, but it is not proper to claim that the retention of *a* here has this ground, it is due to the inclusion (in rule x1 16) of *jagñe* among the words which do not cause the elision: for such inclusion would otherwise be to no purpose (since there is in the *Saṁhitā* no other passage to which the prescription should apply). Any other case seeming to require the interpretation here in question I have not noticed, and we have the right to presume that, if the commentator had knowledge of one which supported his view more unequivocally, he would not have failed to refer to it. So far as appears, then, the sole object of this forced

'va⁵ sam te vāyur (iv 1 4¹) ity atra sa---- ity etat krāram
vva (v 1 5¹) ity atrā 'pi tathā 'va brāhmanavākyeshu tu' tri-
paḍamātrād vā lāryān bhavati brāhmanavākyeshu pūrvastha-
lasyāi' 'vo 'kṛh⁸ yathā imām agrbhānan raṣaṇām⁹
(iv 1 2¹) ity atra mar---- ity etad vākyam¹⁰ ut krāma (v 1 3¹)
ity atrā 'pi tathā 'va bhavati lāryabhāyāḥ padasya trtiyatvam
iti kim prth---- ity¹¹ ukhye ye---- iti rudrottamānuvāke
prabhrti' ti kim tvam agne rudrah (i 3 14¹) iti yājñayām
divas--- iti vākyam agnaye 'nnavate (ii 2 4¹) ity atra

interpretation of the word *tripadaprabhṛti* (one which the word may be said decidedly not to admit of) is to save rule xi 16 from the charge of repetition in a single point we shall presume with much greater plausibility that, when the rule was made, the fact that this particular case was already covered by i 61 was overlooked

But the commentator virtually admits the unsoundness of his own work by acknowledging that in the *brāhmana*-passages (*brāhmanavākya*) of the *Sanhitā* a simple phrase of three words is enough to justify the application of the rule, "because," he says, "of the quotation in the *brāhmana*-passages of a previously-occurring phrase" that is to say, because the prose part of the *Sanhitā* is to so great an extent occupied with citing and commenting on the phrases and words of other parts—a fact which has, doubtless, been the special occasion and suggestion of the present rule. Thus, the words *maryaṣṛī sprhayad varno agnih* are quoted at v 1 3³ (with the customary addition, *ity āha*), from the previous passage iv 1 2⁵ and although the *nābhim* which follows *agnih* at its first occurrence is not also quoted, and the quotation is not therefore a *tripadaprabhṛti* according to the commentator's construction of this term, the rule holds good, and the *a* of *agnih* has a right to stand

The general value of this rule is that of a limitation to the last but one, it points out a class of cases in which a rule given for a particular passage is not limited to that passage, but also acts elsewhere, in which, moreover, such a rule does not govern *niṭyam*, 'against all opposition,' the reading of the passage to which it relates

The commentator notices the fact that the repetition of the final word of the rule indicates the conclusion of the chapter. Such repetition is made at the end of each chapter, and by all the manuscripts, and, as it is thus farther ratified by the comment, I have not hesitated to admit it as an authentic part of the text of the *Prātiçākhyā*. G M repeat the whole rule in this case

*itah--- iti punaruktam tat¹² tathāi 'vā 'bhavad¹³ iti cet māi
'vam tripadamātrād⁴ eva tathābhāva¹⁵ iti¹⁸ vaktum na yuktam
kim tu jāṇīe sañsphānah (xi 16) iti jāṇīegrahanasāmarthyāt.
¹⁷anyathā tasya¹⁸ vādyarthya¹⁷,*

padavīpsā¹⁹ 'dhyāyaparisaṃśiptim dyotayati

*iti tribhāṣhyaratne prātiçākhyavivarane
prathamō 'dhyāyāḥ*

¹ G M om ² W *nāya*, G M *shena* ³ G M *idam* ⁴ G M ins *hi* ⁵ G M. ins *tathā* ⁶ G M om ⁷ G M *purvasya* ⁸ G M *'ktah* ⁹ G M om ¹⁰ G M om ¹¹ G M ins *ebhya* ¹² G M om ¹³ G M *syād* ¹⁴ G M *tripadād*. ¹⁵ G M *tathā bhavatu* ¹⁶ G M ins *atra* ⁽¹⁷⁾ W om ¹⁸ G M *tasyāi 'va*. ¹⁹ G M *padavītyā*

CHAPTER II

CONTENTS 1-11, general mode of production of articulate sounds, distinction of surd and sonant sounds, etc., 12-29, special rules for the production of vowels and diphthongs, 30, nasals, 31-34, difference of vowels and consonants, 35-39, mode of production of mutes, 40-43, of semivowels, 44-45, of spirants, 46-48, of *h* and *ḥ*, 49-52, of nasal sounds

अथ शब्दोत्पत्तिः ॥ १ ॥

1 Now for the origin of sound

For the word *atha* in this rule the commentator allows us our choice between two interpretations it either indicates immediate succession—thus, the list of articulate sounds having been given, there next arises the desire to know what is the cause of these sounds, or how they become apprehensible by the sense, and then follows the explanation here to be given—or it is introductory, signifying that from this point onward the subject of the origin of sound is the one had in hand. Compare the similar and yet more lengthy discussion under rule 11. He then goes on to draw out the significance of the rule itself. *Ābda* he explains by *dhvani* both, when used thus distinctively, mean audible sound in general, rather than articulate sound or voice (compare xii 1,2, xiii 3). He paraphrases “of the articulate sounds, *a* etc, the cause of perception, or their origin, their birth, the apprehension by the sense—just as, even before water is seen, there is moisture in the ground, and that becomes visible in consequence of digging—this is the subject of description.” We seem to catch here a glimpse of that same doctrine of the eternity of sound to which reference was made above, under 157 our organs do not properly produce it, but their action brings it to the cognizance of the senses, as the action of digging brings water to light

1 *ukto varnasamāmnāyah teshām varnāṇām kīdrk¹ kāra-*
nam² katham vā tadupalabdhir ity ākāṅkshānantaram³ nirūpyata
ity ānuntaryārtho 'thaṣabdah atha vā ita uttaram yad vaksh-
yate tac chabdotpattir ity etad⁴ adhikṛtam veditavyam ity adhikā-
rārthah ṣabdo nāma dhvanih varnāṇām akārādinām upādā-
nakāranam⁵ tadutpattir⁶ janma upalabdhir vā yatho 'dakasya
'darṣanāt pūrvam eva bhūmāu jalam asty eva tat khaṇanād⁷ dr-
yate tadvat⁸ se 'yam ucyata⁹ iti sūtrārthah

¹ G M *kīdrkam* ² W *karanam* ³ G M *ins tan* ⁴ G M *om* ⁵ B *-karanam*
⁶ G M *tasya ut* ⁷ W B *om* ⁸ MSS *khaṇanā* ⁹ G M *drabhyata*

वायुशरीरसमीरणत्कण्ठोरसोः संधाने ॥२॥

2 By the setting in motion of air by the body, at the junction of throat and breast

The first part of this rule (literally, 'from air-body-impulsion') is obscurely expressed, and of ambiguous meaning. The commentator gives three explanations of it, the first of which is also itself obscure. Agni ('fire, warmth'—'heat of the body?'), he says, impels Vayu ('air, wind'), that is what "air-body" means (but how?) From such an impulsion—that is to say, expulsion, effort at utterance—at the junction of, or between, throat and breast, comes the origination of sound. And he quotes a verse from the Qikshā (verses 8-9 of the Yajus version, verses 6-7 of the Rik version—see Weber's Ind Stud., iv 350-1) "the mind impels the body-fire, that sets in motion air, and air, moving in the breast, generates a gentle tone." Again (or rather, apparently, as a part of the same explanation—but its inconsistency with the rest is palpable), he makes a copulative compound of *vāyu-ṣarīra*, namely 'air-and-body' "from the impulsion of those two." Once more, he quotes as the opinion of other authorities that *vāyu-ṣarīra* means 'the air in the body,' the compound being of such a sort that that which should be its first member is put last, after the analogy of *rājadanta*, 'upper incisor' (literally, 'king-tooth'—that is, as the Hindu etymologists explain it, 'tooth-king, chief among the teeth'), and the other words composing that *gana* (to Pān ii 2 31). And he adds the remark that, in this interpretation, the air is understood as the cause of the impulsion, not its product.

In the translation of the rule given above, the primary division of the compound is regarded as to be made after *vāyu*, *ṣarīra-samīraṇa* meaning an 'impulsion by the body,' and *vāyu* being prefixed in a genitive relation, 'of the air.' This is haish, but appears to me more acceptable and less violent than the other constructions proposed. Practically, the point is of small consequence.

2 *vāyur agniḥ samīrayati*¹ *ti vāyuṣarīram tathābhūtāt samīranāt preranād abhigātāt*² *ity arthaḥ kanthorasoh samāhāne madhyadeṣe ṣabdotpattir bhavati*³ *ti*⁴ *śikṣā cāi*⁵ *vam asti*⁶ *ti*⁷ *manah kāyāgnim*⁸ *āhanti*⁹ *sa*¹⁰ *prerayati mārutam*¹¹ *mārutas tū*¹² *rasi caran mandram janayati*¹³ *svaram*¹⁴ *iti*¹⁵ *vāyuṣ ca ṣarīram ca vāyuṣarīre tayoh samīranam tasmāt*¹⁶ *anye tv āhuḥ vāyoh ṣarīre sataḥ samīranam*¹⁷ *tasmāc chabdotpattir iti tatre*¹⁸ *ti*¹⁹ *tīham samāsaḥ*²⁰ *rājadantāditi vāc charīrasya*²¹ *paranipātaḥ ṣarīre vāyur*²² *vāyuṣarīram tasya samīranam*²³ *tasmāt asmin mate vāyoh samīranakartrtvam eva na tu karmatvam*

¹ G M *abhya-* ² G M *om* ³ G M *om* ⁴ G M *gms* ⁵ G M *kanti*
⁶ G M *sam* ⁷ G M *om* ⁸ G M *om* ⁹ G M *ins* *vāyuṣarīrasamīranāt*
¹⁰ B *om* ¹¹ G M *atre* ¹² G M *raṣabdasya* ¹³ G M *om*

Compare with what is taught by our treatise here and later
(xxii 1,2, xxiii 1-3) Vaj Pr 16-9, Rik Pr xiii 1

तस्य प्रातिश्रुत्कानि भवत्युरः कण्ठः शिरो मुखं
नासिके इति ॥ ३ ॥

3 The parts which give it audible quality are breast, throat, head, mouth, and nostrils

The commentator explains *prātiśruthāni* as signifying 'the places of production (*sthānāni*), having to do with the resonance (*pratiśrut*=*pratidhrani*, 'resonance'), of the aforesaid sound (*śabdā*)'. He offers no remark upon the organs enumerated, but leaves their various offices to be derived from the rules which follow. But, in anticipation of the next three rules, he observes that they teach the three-fold quality of sound, as sonant, surd, and *h*-sound, rule 4 giving the definition of the first kind

The *Çikṣā* (v 13 Weber's Ind Stud iv 351) makes an enumeration of eight *sthānas*, or places of production of articulate sounds, dividing the "mouth" of our list into root of the tongue, teeth, lips, and palate

संवृते कण्ठे नादः क्रियते ॥ ४ ॥

4 When the throat is closed, tone is produced

The commentator treats this rule as a definition of the technical term *nāda*, 'tone,' and cites rule 8, below, as an example of the use of the term

The Rik Pr (xiii 1) gives a corresponding definition of sonant utterance, but specifies the aperture (*lha*) of the throat as the part whose contraction or closure produces the tone. Compare also Vaj Pr 111. It is greatly to the credit of the ancient Hindu phonetists that they had gained by acute observation so clear an idea of the manner in which the intonation of the breath is effected in the throat, but precisely how accurate a knowledge

3 *tasya prakṛtasya*¹ *śabdasyo* 'rahprabhrtim *sthānāni* ² *bhavanti* *pratiśrut*³ *pratidhrani*⁴ 'tatsambandhīm *prātiśruthāni*⁵
⁶ *samirte kanthe nādah krīyate* (11 4) *etadādunā sūtratrayena*
*śabdātāvvidhyam*⁷ *ucyate* *nādah*⁸ *śvāso hākāraś ce* 'ti *tāyan*
*nādulakṣhanam āha*⁹

¹ G M *prakṛt* ² G M *ms* *pratiśrutham* ³ G M *śruti* ⁴ W *om*
(⁵) G M insert this (excepting the rule) at the beginning of the commentary to the next rule ⁶ G M *śabdasya tr* ⁷ MSS *nāda* ⁸ G M *ucyate*

4 *samirte kanthe yah śabdah krīyate sa nādasamyñño bhavati*
*samyññyāh*¹ *prayojanam* *nādo* 'nupradānam (11 8) *iti*²

¹ G M *nādasam-* ² G M *ity ad*

they had of the nature and action of the vocal chords, whose tension produces the closure, we, of course, cannot say

विवृते श्वासः ॥ ५ ॥

5 When it is opened, breath is produced

The explanation given of this rule corresponds with that of the preceding, and the rule cited for the use of the term *śvāsa*, 'breath,' is 11 10

मध्ये हकारः ॥ ६ ॥

6 When in an intermediate condition, the *h*-sound is produced

Madhye is explained as meaning 'in a method intermediate between closed and opened' the rest of the comment agrees with the two preceding, and the cited rule is 11 9

Of the other Prāticākhyas, only that of the R̥g-Veda sets up a third kind of articulated material, besides tone and breath, and that (111 2) derives the material from a combination of the two others, rather than their mean. I have already (note to Ath Pr 1 13) expressed my opinion that the attempt to establish this distinction is forced and futile, and I see at present no reason for changing it. That intonated and unintonated breath should be emitted from the same throat at once is physically impossible. In loud stridulous whispering, there is a tension of the vocal chords only short of that which gives rise to sonant vibration, and if any one chooses to claim that the aspirations used in loud speaking partake of such a character, sometimes or always, we need not be at the pains to contradict him.

ता वर्णप्रकृतयः ॥ ७ ॥

7 Those are the materials of alphabetic sounds

That is to say, the three kinds of material just described—tone, breath, and *h*-sound, some letters having one of these as the material out of which they are made, and others another. Just so, it is added, jars and dishes have clay for their material, and thread is the material of cloth.

The commentator then goes on to raise and answer a grammatical objection to the form of the rule. Since it is the office of a

5 *vivṛte kanthe yah śabdah kṛyate sa śvāsasamyño bhavati samyñāyāḥ prayojanam aghośheṣhu śvāsaḥ* (11 10) *iti*.

6 *samvṛtavivṛtayor madhye madhyaprakāre yah śabdah kṛyate sa haḥśrasamyño bhavati samyñāyāḥ prayojanam haḥśro hacaturtheshv* (11 9) *iti*.

pronoun to call to mind things already mentioned, and the words *nāda*, *śvāsa*, and *hakāra*, which are referred to by the pronoun in this rule, are masculine, why is the pronoun feminine (*tāh*, instead of *te*)? The reply is “by the *dictum* of the Mahābhāshya, ‘pronouns effecting the equivalence of the thing pointed at and of that which is pointed out respecting it assume at pleasure the gender of either of the two,’ is established the propriety of the form used in the rule, therefore there takes place a mutual accordance, or apposition” The passage referred to is apparently that found, not in the Mahābhāshya itself, but in Kaiyata’s Mahābhāshya-pradīpa, nearly at the beginning of the work (I owe this reference to the kindness of Prof Goldstucker) in Ballantyne’s edition (p 7) it reads, with several variations from the text given by our commentator, *uddiśyamānapratinnrddiśyamānayoḥ ekatvam āpādayanti sarvanāmanā paryāyena tallīgam upādudatu iti* Reference is again made to this passage for a similar purpose under v 2

The Rik Pr (xiii 2) has this rule also, in nearly identical form

नादो अनुप्रदानं स्वर्घोषवत्सु ॥ ८ ॥

8 In vowels and sonant consonants, the emission is sound

The term *anupradāna* is etymologized as representing *anupradīyate* ‘nēna varnāh’, ‘therewith is given forth an articulate sound,’ and *anupradīyate* is farther explained by *upadīyate*, ‘is obtained,’ and *janyate*, ‘is generated’ As synonym for the same term is given *mūlakāraṇa*, ‘radical cause’

I have already (note to Ath Pr 113) called attention to the praiseworthy unanimity with which the Hindu phonetists define

7 *varnānām prakṛtayo varnaprakṛtayah tā varnaprakṛtayo bhavanti ye nādaśvāsaḥakārā uktāh nādaprakṛtayah kecid varnāh śvāsaprakṛtayo ‘nye hakāraprakṛtayo ‘nye yathā mṛtprakṛtayo ghaṭaśarāvādayah yathā vā¹ tantuprakṛtayah patāh nanu sarvanāmanāh prakṛtuparāmargitvān² nādaśvāsaḥakāreṣhu punnliṅgeṣhu³ satsu tā iti strīliṅgaḥ prayogah katham sādhuḥ ucyate nrddiśyamānapratinnrddiśyamānayoḥ⁴ ekatām āpādayanti sarvanāmanānā kāmācāreṇa tallīgam⁵ upādudatu iti mahābhāshya-vacanāt prayogasādhutvam adhyavasīyate tasmād anyonyānvayah⁶ sambhavati⁷*

¹ G M om ² G M *rakatu* ³ G M ins *paraman śarheṣhu* ⁴ W *-prakṛtinnrdd-* ⁵ W *-ngtam*, G M *tattall* ⁶ G M *yasambhavah* ⁷ G M om

8 *svareṣhu ghoshavatsū ca¹ varneṣhu nādo ‘nupradānam bhavati. anupradīyate ‘nēna varnā² ity anupradānam mūlakāraṇam anupradīyata upadīyate janyata ity arthah*

¹ W om ² W B *-nā*

the true ground of the distinction between surd and sonant letters European phonetists, after long perplexing the subject with such false distinctions as are expressed by the terms "soft" and "hard," "weak" and "strong," and the like, seem now at last to be coming to a universal accordance in the correct view

हकारो हचतुर्थेषु ॥ १ ॥

9 In *h* and in sonant aspirate mutes, it is *h*-sound

For the quality of this *h*-sound, see rule 6, above. The Rik Pr (xii 2,5 rules 6,17) connects in the same manner *h* and the "fourth" mutes. Our treatise evidently regards the peculiar *h*-sound belonging to the sonant aspirates not as something that follows the breach of contact, but as inhering in the letter, in the same manner as tone in the simple sonants. Whether the Rik P₁ hints at a difference of opinion on this point may be made a matter of question. But the failure on the part of the Prāticākhyas to recognize the essentially compound character of the aspirate mutes, the fact that these differ from the unaspirated mutes by interposing something between the mute and the following vowel, is one of then marked weaknesses.

The commentator enters into no labored exposition of the rule, but spends his strength, rather, in defending its situation. He first suggests the objection that it is not in proper place, as offending against the order observed in the definition of the three kinds of material (the *h*-sound is defined last, and we should therefore expect the letters containing it to be specified last), but claims in reply that it is, after all, in place, being intended to obviate an undue extension of the preceding rule, which would otherwise be liable to be made, since *h* and the "fourth" mutes are included (by 113,14) among the sonant consonants, to which that rule applies.

अचोषेषु श्वासः ॥ १० ॥

10 In surd consonants, it is breath

Which are the surd consonants, was taught us in rule 112

9 *hakāraḥ*¹ ca caturthāḥ ca hacaturthāḥ teshu varneshu² *hakāro* 'nupradānam bhavati nanu saṃjñāvidhānakramabhāṅga-prasaṅgān³ nā 'tre 'dam sūtram avatarati ghoshavatsv iti sāmānyān nādo hacaturtheshu ca⁴ prasajyate⁵ ity atiprasaṅgaparihārārthatvād avataraty eve 'ti vādām⁶

¹ W *haḥ* ² W om ³ G M B *bhāṅgān* ⁴ G M om ⁵ G M *-jyeta* ⁶ G M, *vādāh*

10 *aghosheshu varneshu svāso* 'nupradānam bhavati'

¹ B omits rule and comment

भूयान्प्रथमेभ्यो ऽन्येषु ॥ ११ ॥

11 And more of it in the other surd letters than in the simple surd mutes

Here *śvāsa*, 'breath,' is continued by implication from the preceding rule "in virtue of vicinage" (*sāmnidhyāt*), as the commentator says (there being no *ca*, 'and,' in the rule, to indicate it directly) The other surd letters are the surd aspirate mutes and the spirants (excepting *h*) There is no separation made of these two classes upon the important ground that in the spirants the greater expenditure of breath inheres in the whole character of the sound, as being fricative, while in the aspirate mutes it consists in a brief emission between the explosion of the contact and the following vowel

The Rik Pr (xiii 6 rule 19) says "some regard the breath in the aspirates as quicker"—an ambiguously indefinite expression

अवर्णे नात्युपसङ्कृतमोष्ठरुन् नातिव्यस्तम् ॥ १२ ॥

12 In forming the *a*-vowels, the lips and jaws must not be too nearly approximated, nor too widely separated

The plain intent of this rule appears to be to guard against an excess either of openness or of closeness in the utterance of *a* and *ā*, while at the same time these two sounds are considered as alike in quality Such is not, however, the understanding of the commentator, he declares it impossible to follow both directions in forming one sound, and directs that a division be made excessive approximation is to be avoided in the case of *a*, and excessive separation in those of the long *ā* and protracted *ās* If his intention had been to recognize the same difference in quality between *a* and *ā* which is taught by the Ath Pr and Vāj P₁ and by Pāṇini (see note to Ath P₁ 1 36), he would have been likely to apply the two directions of the rule in a contrary manner, warning against over-openness in *a* and over-closeness in *ā*

11 *sāmnidhyāt śvāsa itī labhyate prathamēbhyo 'nyeshv aghosheshu śvāso¹ bhūyān adhiko bhavati*

¹ G M om

12 *avarṇa uccāryamāna oṣṭhahanaṁ atyupasaṁhrtam atisaṁ-
gṣhṣhtam na bhavati itivyastam ativivrtam¹ ca na² bhavati
oṣṭhān ca hanā c³ oṣṭhahanaṁ dvandvaḥ ca prānātūryasenān-
gānām (Pāṇ 11 4 2) ity ekavadbhāvaḥ tad etad⁴ ekasminn ubha-
yathā na śakyate kartum itī yogavibhāgaḥ kāryaḥ⁵ akāre nā⁶
'atyupasaṁhrtam akāre ca⁷ plute ca nā⁸ itivyastam itī*

(¹) W na ca (²) W eva tad, G M om (³) G M B om (⁴) W G nā (⁵) W B om

The term *oshthakanu*, though singular, is declared to signify the two lips and the two jaws, and a rule of Pāṇini (11.4 2) is quoted in justification of such treatment of a copulative compound

ओकारे च ॥ १३ ॥

13 Also in uttering *o*

The “also” (*ca*) of this rule, we are told, brings forward only the action of the jaws prescribed in the preceding rule this appears from the fact that the one following gives a special direction with regard to the action of the lips In forming an *o*, then, the jaws are not to be too widely separated

ओष्ठौ तूपसङ्कतरौ ॥ १४ ॥

14 But the lips are more nearly approximated

“Vicinage” is here again made the sufficiently obvious ground of assuming that the direction applies to the utterance of *o* The “but” (*tu*) of the rule, according to Vararuci, one of the three authorities from whom our comment is principally derived (see the introduction), annuls the direction formerly (in rule 12) given as to the position of the lips but Māhīsheya, another of the same authorities, has explained it as exempting from the widely separated condition the *o* of such words as *bandhoh* (11 5 87) This latter interpretation is quite absurd, or else I am very obtuse with regard to it.

As regards the precise tone of the *o*, such directions as these can teach us nothing satisfactory The only valuable conclusion which we derive from them is that the authors of the Prāṭiśākhya looked upon the sound as a simple homogeneous tone—not phonetically diphthongal, although in classification excluded (by rule 12) from the category of simple vowels The same, we shall see, is the case with *e* also

ईषत्प्रकृष्टाविकारे ॥ १५ ॥

15 In uttering *e*, they are slightly protracted

13 cakāro hanumātrakāryānvādeṣakah oshthakāryasya parasātrena viśeshavidhānāt okāra uccāryamāne hanā ativyaste na bhavatah

14 sāmīdhyād okāra itī labhyate okāre kārya oshthāv¹ upasamhrtatardū syātām tuṣabḍa oshthayoh pūrvoktavādhīm² nvārayatī³ itī vararucir uvāca. māhīsheyas tu bābhāshe. bandhor ity ādhikam okāram savyaṅjanam⁴ vyastuto⁵ nvārayatī⁶ itī.

¹ W B om ² G M vār- ³ G M vyaṅj ⁴ W vyes-

That "they" means the lips is, we are told, sufficiently indicated by the dual number of the adjective *Prakṛṣhta*, 'protracted,' is glossed by *samnikṛṣhta*, 'drawn down together, brought near'

उपसङ्गतरे कनू ॥ १६ ॥

16 The jaws are more nearly approached

The force of the comparative is explained by the usual term *atīṣayena*, 'with excess'

In the utterance of *e*, the position of the tongue is also a matter of importance, and is explained in the next rule

निह्वामध्यान्ताभ्यां चोत्तराङ्गम्यात्स्पर्शयति ॥ १७ ॥

17 And one touches the borders of the upper back jaws with the edges of the middle of the tongue

The "and" (*ca*) in this rule we are directed to regard as bringing forward the *ekāra* of rule 15, "on the frog-leap principle"—that is to say, by overleaping the intervening rule. The terms descriptive of the organs concerned I have translated in accordance with the directions of the commentator, although much tempted to render *jambhyan* by 'jaw-teeth, grinders'. I cannot doubt that *jambhyan* is the true reading here, although the MSS give a curious and perplexing variety of forms to the word, and *uttarāṇ jambhyan* is not once read. T comes nearest to it, giving *uttarāṇ jambhyan*, W has *uttarā jambhyan* in the rule, and *uttarā jambhyan* and *jambhyan* in the comment, B, *uttarāṇ jambhyan* in the rule, *uttarā jambhyan* and *jambhyan* in the comment, G and M, *uttarāṇ jambhyan* in the rule, G, *uttarāṇ jambhyan* and *jambhyan*, and M, *uttarāṇ jambhyan* and *jambhyan*, in the comment. The verb *sparṣayati* is equivalent to *spr̥ṣet*, the causative ending *nic* being added without altering the meaning of the simple verb (compare Pāṇ 11 1 25), as in *pālay* for *pā*, and other like cases

15 *prakṛṣhtāu ity atra dvivacanena prakṛṣhtāu oṣṭhāu grhyete ekāre hāya oṣṭhāu īṣṭapṛakṛṣhtāu syātām prakṛṣhtatā samnikṛṣhtatā*

16 *sāmnādhyaṅ ekāra itī labhyate ekāre kārye hanū upasamhrtatīre bhavatah atīṣayeno 'pasamhṛte upasamhrtatāre*

17 *ekāre kārye jīhvāmadhyāntābhyām uttarāṇ jambhyan sparṣayati spr̥ṣet ity arthah pālayati 'ty ādivat svārthe nic jambhyan itī hanūmāluprāntadeṣān' ity arthah mandākaphutrinīyāyena' cakāra ekāram ākarṣhati jīhvāyā 'madhyam jīhvāmadhyam tasyā 'ntān' tābhyām jīhvāmadhyāntābhyām*

¹ G M *pakhy-* ² G M *-cam*, W *ntaprade-* ³ G M *-kagatmy-* ⁴ W *ma dhya antāu*, B *madhyasya anan*

In order to complete the definition of the mode of production of *e*, rules 20 and 23, below, have yet to be applied, but they add nothing essential to the description of the present rule, which assures to the vowel, as clearly as any such description could do, the "continental" sound of *e*, or that which it has in *they*, short in *met*. There is no hint of a composite or diphthongal utterance, any more than in the case of *o*. A diphthongal utterance, however, as *ai*, *au* (in *aisle*, *house*), we must assume them to have had originally (compare note to Ath Pr 140)

उपसंस्कृतरे च जिह्वाग्रमृकार्कारल्कारेषु बर्त्स्वि-
पूपसंस्करति ॥ १८ ॥

18 The jaws, also, are more closely approximated, and the tip of the tongue is brought into close proximity to the upper back gums, in *r*, *ṛ*, and *l*

The construction of this rule is very harsh the subject *hanā*, 'jaws,' comes into its first member again with a flying leap from rule 16, drawn by the *ca*, 'also,' while the second member starts off independently, "one approximates," with no connective to bind it to the other. These roughnesses are unremarked by the commentator, and I have smoothed them over in the translation. The word *upasamharati*, 'approximates,' is glossed in the comment by *nikshipet*, 'let one throw down (or apply),' and *barsvās* is explained as 'the high places behind the row of teeth'—that is, the swelling of the inner gums.

The commentator starts a question as to the propriety of the conversion of *ṛ* and *l* in this rule into *r* and *l* after *a* (*rkārarkā-ralkāra*, from *rkāra rkāra-lkāra*), the cases not being covered by the prescription given below (at x 8 no case of the combination of *ṛ* and *l* occurring in the *Sanhitā*, the *Pratīcākhya* makes no provision for it) he is compelled to acknowledge that this treatise does not teach the conversion, but claims that it is justified by the authority of other text-books, and that the same explanation applies to an earlier case (rule 131) of a like combination.

This wholly insufficient direction is all that our treatise gives

18 *caṣabdo hanvor¹ anvādeṣakah rkāra rkāra lkāre ca kārye hanvā² upasamhrtatāre bhavatah jñhvāgram ca barsveshā³ pasamharati nikshipet barsveshv iti dantapañkter upariṣṭād uccapra-deṣeshv ity arthah nanv aram rkārapare (x 8) iti lakṣhaṇa-sambhavād⁴ rkārarkāralkāreshv iti katham samāhih sādhuḥ. satyam nā⁵ tallakṣhaṇāt kim tu gāstrāntarabalāt⁶ evam rkāṇi a-lkārāu hrastāv (131) iti vyñeyam⁷*

¹ W *hanvar*, B *h*, G *M hanor* ² W *om* ³ G *M -nas-*, B *-nasamjñavādād*
⁴ G *M ins sādhuḥ* ⁵ G *M jñeyam*

us for the utterance of the difficult *r* and *l* vowels By 12, they are excluded from the category of simple homogeneous vowels For the teachings of the other Prāticākhyas respecting them, see note to Ath Pr 137 However they may have been pronounced at the period of grammatical treatment of the Vedic texts, we have no good reason to doubt that, at the time when those texts were composed, they were phonetically the same with the semi-vowels *r* and *l*, differing from them only as, for example, the *l* of *able* differs from that of *ably*, the *r* of (French) *argre* from that of *argri* For a theoretical discussion of this double value of the articulated sounds which lie nearly upon the boundary line between vowels and consonants, see Journ Am Or Soc viii 362 seq

एकेषामनुस्वारस्वरभक्तयोश्च ॥ ११ ॥

19 As also, according to some, in *anusvāra* and *svara-bhakti*

In this case, we are told, the “also” (*ca*) brings down the whole of the preceding rule, and the meaning is, that there is approximation of the jaws in uttering *anusvāra*, and approach of the tip of the tongue to the gums in uttering the *svarabhakti*, according to the opinion of some, while others hold that *anusvāra* is simply nasal, and the *svarabhakti* (see xxi 15) equivalent to *r* This, the commentator adds, is Vararuci’s explanation, and its truth is questionable We, in our turn, may regard it as matter for question whether this attribution and expression of doubt apply to the whole interpretation of the rule, or only to its concluding part, the statement of the opinion of “others” The latter is perhaps most probable

So far as regards *anusvāra*, we can hardly ascribe any value or propriety to this rule, the definition of *svarabhakti* in connection with that of the *r*-vowels is natural enough

अनादिशे प्रणयस्ता जिह्वा ॥ २० ॥

20 In the absence of special direction, the tongue is thrust down forward

When no such direction as “with the point of the tongue,” “with

19 *cukārah pūrvoktavādhim anvādhati yāthāsamkhyenā* *’nusvārasvarabhaktiyoh pūrvoktavādhir bhavati anusvāre hanvor upasamhārah svarabhaktāu jihvāgrasya barsveshā* *’pasamhārah etad ekeshām matam anyeshām tu matam anusvārasyā* *’nūnā-sikamātratvam svarabhakter rīkātulyatvam iti vararucimā-* *tum². tae cintyam³*

¹ G M *khyo* ² G M *-civacitām* ³ W *cintyam*, B *cāntiyam*

the middle of the tongue" is given, then its position is to be understood as here directed. To explain *pranyastā*, the commentator gives, besides an ordinary analysis, the expression "in a quiescent state," as example, he cites *upa mā* (111 24¹). G and M spoil the citation by adding the following word, *dyāvāprthivī*, in the utterance of which words the tongue is not called perceptibly into action. But this interpretation evokes a difficulty "since the position of quiescence is assured to all the articulating organs in the absence of any direction respecting them, of what use is this precept?" The reply is *e* (as taught by rule 17, above) is to be produced with the edges of the middle of the tongue, and the *a* contained in that letter is of the same character, hence it might be inferred, from the identity of the *a*-quality, that *a* was to be so uttered in other situations, as in words like *atha* (11 13¹ et al, if the word is to be regarded here as a citation)—a misapprehension which the rule removes. To this reply the objection may be raised that our treatise acknowledges the presence of no such element as *a* in *e*, and that an *a* uttered with the middle of the tongue is a phonetic impossibility. The direction respecting the tongue may well enough be regarded as a not entirely negative one, or it may have been deemed desirable to fix so very mobile and unruly a member by a special law.

अकारवदोष्ठी ॥ २१ ॥

21 The lips are as in the utterance of *a*

We are directed to include in this rule, by vicinage, "in the absence of special direction." The proper position of the lips for uttering *a* was given in rule 12, above. As illustration is added, quite needlessly, the word *indrāḥ* (*passim*), the southern manuscripts read instead *indravyāvāḥ* (v1 5 8³).

20 *yatra jhivāgrenā jhivāmādhylene 'ty ādir' anādeṣas² tatra viśhaye jhivā pranyastā tūshnīmabhūtā³ bhavati prakarshena nyastā pranyasta⁴ yathā upa----* nanv anādeṣe sarvakara-nānām tūshnīmabhāvasiddheh karmartho 'yam ārambhah ucyate ekādrasya jhivāmādhyañtanāshpādhyatvam⁵ asti⁶ tadavayavasyā⁷ 'kādrasya tathātvam asti akāratvasāmyād anyatrā⁸ 'py athe 'ty ādir tathātvam prasajyeta tac cā 'nishtam tan mā bhūd iti parihārah⁹ 'nā¹⁰ 'deṣo 'nādeṣaḥ¹¹ tasmin upadeṣābhāvā ity arthah.

¹ G M ādind ² G M ins anupadeṣah ³ W B nibh- ⁴ W B om ⁵ G M dyamānatvam ⁶ G M asti 'ti ⁷ G M ins 'pi ⁸ W anvādeṣah, B anadeṣah

21 *sāmnādhyañ anādeṣa iti labhyate oshthayor yatrā 'nādeṣas tatrā 'kādravad akāre yathā tathā¹ oshthāu bhavatah nā 'tyupa-samhrtatarāv² ity arthah yathā indra³ iti*

¹ MSS tathā ² G M hrtāv ³ G M indryāva

तालौ त्रिह्वामध्यमिवर्णे ॥ २२ ॥

22 In the *i* vowels, the middle of the tongue is to be approximated to the palate

The comment supplies, without remark, the predicate "to be approximated," and gives as example *ishe tvā* (1.1 1 et al)

एकारे च ॥ २३ ॥

23 Also in *e*

Here the "also" (*ca*) brings down the whole of the preceding precept, both the specification of the active organ (*karana*) and that of the passive organ or place (*sthāna*). The exposition of the meaning of the rule is very simple and easy, but the commentator does not fail to notice that its necessity is open to objection upon two grounds, and enters into its defense at considerable length. The first objection is, why make two separate rules (22 and 23) for a single direction?—that is to say, if the *i*-vowels and *e* are all produced by the approximation of the middle of the tongue to the palate, why not include them in one rule together? The answer given is that the degree of approximation is not the same in the two cases, but is less in the *e* than in the *i*-vowels. If it be asked, why is this so? the reply is made, because the *e* is mixed with *a*, and production of this *a* with the middle of the tongue is on account of its constituting a part of *e*, and not by reason of its own natural character (compare the comment to rule 20, above)—which special qualification is sufficient ground for the less degree of approximation. The second difficulty is stated thus both place and organ of *e* have been already defined in rules 15–17, above, but here is laid down for the same letter something different and it is not possible that both directions should be followed

22 *varṇe kārye jhivāmadhyam tālāv upasamhartavyam yathā ishe----* 'jhivādyā madhyam' jhivāmadhyam¹

(1) W om 2 B om

23 *ca*kārah pārvavīdhim anvādhātī ekāre kārye 'jhivāmadhyam tālāv' upasamhartavyam² namu vidhāu samāne prthak-sūtrāmbhah kimarthah³ ucyate varṇe yathā jhivāmadhyo pasamhāro na khalv evam ekāre kim tu tato⁴ nyūna ity arthah kutāh akāramicratatvād ekārasya akārasya ca tadekadeṣatvāḍ jhivāmadhyāntanishpādyatvam⁵ na tu svataḥ ata eva sopādhi-katvān nyūnatvopapattih īśatprakrshṭāv (u 15) ity atra⁶ sūtratrayenār 'kārasya sthānakarane nirdiṣṭe iha tu tato "nyat tasyār' va nirdiṣyate tad ekasminn ubhayathā kartum na śak-yate virodhāt tasmād atra yogavibhāgah kartavyaḥ⁷ avyāñ-

in the production of one sound To get rid of this difficulty, a division must be made, the former description must be understood as applying to *e* by itself, and the present one to *e* combined with a consonant How is this determination made? Why, when we say in a general way "the letter *e*," it lies nearest, or is most natural, to understand that letter itself, without a consonant, hence, because of its prior suggestedness, the first definition belongs to it, and the other is left, to be applied to the same sound as combined with a consonant

The utter artificiality of the answer to the second objection is too obvious to need pointing out, and even the first evokes more difficulties than it removes There is no inconsistency whatever between rules 17 and 23, and we have reason to be surprised only at the repetition in the latter of what is implied already in the former Rule 23 has the air of being an afterthought, slipped in, because of the really close relationship between *e* and *i*, with disregard of what had been taught before The alleged difference of degree of approximation exists clearly enough, but would be very insufficiently intimated by a mere separation of one rule into two

अष्टोपसंस्कार उद्गर्णः ॥ २४ ॥

24 In the *u*-vowels, there is approximation of the lips

After his paraphrase of the rule, the commentator enters here upon an exposition, the intent of which is not altogether clear to me "Here," he says, "approximation is as formerly, and not mere drawing down together" (that is, of the same kind as was taught in rule 14, above, and not the *prākṛṣhtatā*, 'protraction,' of rule 15, which is there glossed by *samnikṛṣhtatā*⁹) "However, 'the lips drawn down together may be long'—this will be said hereafter" (by this phrase some direction given later in the treatise is

*jane tal lakshanam savyañjane tv etad iti kuto 'yam nyānaḥ ucyate 'ekāra iti' sāmānyoktāu satyām*¹⁰ *prathamam avyañjana-syāt*¹⁰ *'va grahanam mukhyaḥ'*¹¹ *tathā satr prathamapratites*¹² *tasmīn prathamam lakṣaṇam yujyate savyañjane*¹³ *pārīṣeshyād etad iti vyñjeyam*

(1) W G M *dhyantuv* (2) G M *vyān* (3) G M *-tham* (4) G M *ato* (5) B *dhyāntabhyām nish*, G M *dhyānash* (6) G M *om* (7) W *nyānaḥ*, B *nye t* (8) G M *om* (9) G M *ekārasya*, (10) B *pratham av*, G M *-mam vy* (11) W *su-karam* (12) G M *-mam pra* (13) G M *ins tu*

24 *uvarne kārya oṣṭhōpasamhāro bhavati atro 'pasamhārah pṛvavan na samnikṛṣhtatāmātram kim tu samnikṛṣhtāv oṣṭhāu dīrghāu syātām iti vakshyate evam oṣṭhāu tū 'pa-samhrtatarāv* (11 14) *ity atra 'pi vyñjeyam. yathā ut----* *oṣṭhāyor upasamhāra oṣṭhōpasamhārah*¹

¹ W B om

wont to be cited, but there is no such direction as this, either in text or in commentary), "the same is to be understood in rule 14, above" (compare a similar reference to a preceding rule in the comment to 11 18). A phrase is then cited from the *Sanhitā*, containing *u* and *u*, namely *utākhalaabudhno yāpah* (vii 2 1³)

एकान्तरस्तु सर्वत्र प्रकृतात् ॥ २५ ॥

25 But, in all cases, with an interval of one from the preceding

The commentary on this very obscure rule reads as follows

By vicinage, "labial approximation" is here implied everywhere, in the case of labial vowels, after the preceding labial approximation, a separate labial approximation is to be made, provided it have an interval of one by this is understood having the quantity of a *mora* interposed that, namely, has an interval of one whereof one *mora* is the interval or interposition. This is the distinctive condition of the separate labial approximation. The word "but" (*tu*) denies the necessity of the interval of one in a case where *o* [W says, where *āu* or *v*] follows. Examples are *utpūtagushman* (i 6 1¹), *sūnnīyam iti syūnnīyam* (vi 2 4¹), *atho oshadhishu* (iii 5 5² and vi 3 9⁵), *bāhuvoṛ balam* (v 5 9²), *tanuvāu ghorā 'nyā* (v 7 3³ G M omit the last word), *caturhotā* (not found in the *Sanhitā* occurs *Tātt Bāh* 11 2 3⁴)

Objection in *yo 'ñgum* (iii 3 4³), the *anusvāra* has a *mora* [by 1 34] and the *ç* a half-*mora* [by 1 37], since, then, the quantity being a *mora* and a half, there is not an interval of one, how is the separate labial approximation assured?

Answer it is assured by the principle "a hundred includes fifty" Where there is a *mora* and a half, there is *à fortiori* a *mora*, in virtue of this the prescribed effect is produced, but its excess does not vitiate the rule, because the word "one" excludes what does not belong to itself (?). For the same reason, the occurrence

25 *sāmnādhyād oshthopasamhāna itī labhyate sarvatr oshthya-*
svaneshu prakṛtād oshthopasamhārāt prthagoshthopasamhārah
'kātavyah sa ced ekāntarah' ekāntara itī mātrāh ālavyavāyā' itī
labhyate' ekamātrā 'ntaram vyavadhānam yasyā' sāv ekāntarah
itī prthagoshthopasamhārasya vīśhanam tuṣabḍa oḥārapara-
tva' ekāntaratvanyamam' nīvantayati udāharanāni ut-
sūn----- atho----- bāh----- tan----- cat----- nanu
yo----- ity atrā' nusvārasya mātrāh ālah 'çākārasya' rdhamātrā-
kāluh' evam adhyardhamātrātrve saty ekāntaratrābhāvāt' ka-
tham prthagoshthopasamhārasiddhik ucyate gatepañcāganniyā-
yenu sādhyati adhyardhamātrātrve 'py' ekamātratvam sūtārām¹⁰
asti tena kārīyam bhavaty adhikam tu na nishādhyate svāyoga-
vyuvachedukātvād ekaṣabḍasya ata eva bāh----- ity āder¹¹ na

of the double labial in such passages as *bāhuvoṣ balam ūruvoṣ ojaḥ* (v 5 9² G M omit the last word) is not primary (or original), but its quality as *sphurita*, 'quavered,' is shown by the likeness of the example (?)

Second objection then why is there not a separate labial approximation in the two *u*'s following the *k* and *r* of *kusurubandha* (vu 2 2¹), since there occurs more than a *mora* and a half of interval between them?

Answer not so, here there is denial of separate labiality only for the two *u*'s that follow *k* and *s*, because of the absence of its necessary condition, but to that following the *r* this rule does not apply, because it is not a case of separateness from the preceding, but of separateness from the *u* that follows the intermediate *s*, this being so, there is no occurrence of the interval of one for a letter in this situation thus there is no offense against the rule

So far the comment, but either I have failed to apprehend its true meaning, or it has given a false interpretation to the rule, or the rule itself is destitute of intelligible significance I must confess myself unable to see what peculiarity there should be in the utterance of two labial vowels following one another in two successive syllables with not less than a *mora*'s interval between them No precept, so far as I know, in any of the other Prāticākhyas, is analogous with this, or casts light upon it

It appears to be intimated, in the course of the answer to the first objection, that the peculiar utterance of the *u* in such words as *bāhuvoḥ* for the usual *bāhvoh* and *ūruvoḥ* for *ūrvoh* is denominated *sphurita* The term does not occur elsewhere, nor is any notice taken of the phenomenon, if not here It is a well-known characteristic of Tāttirīya texts, but is found in fewer words than one would be apt to imagine Besides the two just given, I have noted in the Sanhitā only the cases of *tanū* (*tanuvam*, e g 1 1 8, *tanuvā*, e g 1 1 10²) and the word *suvar*, which are often met with Of similar resolutions of an *i*-vowel into *vy*, the cases are more nu-

*dviroshthiyam*¹² *mukhyam kim tu sphuritatvam*¹³ *uddāharanatva-*
*bhāsatayā*¹⁴ *darśitam tarhi kus-ity atra kakārarephābhyaṁ*
uttarayor ukārayoh katham prthagoshthopasamhāro na bhavati
*adhyardhamātravyavāyasambhavāt*¹⁵ *māi 'vam atra*¹⁶ *kakāra-*
*sakārottarayor*¹⁷ *ukārayos tāvad*¹⁸ *aprtthagoshthātā*¹⁹ *etallaksha-*
*nāsambhavāt repḥād uttarasya tu*²⁰ *prakṛtāt prthaktvābhāvān*
nā 'yam vidhiḥ ²¹*kim tu*²¹ *madhyasthasakārottārād ukārāt*
*prthaktvam tathā saty ekāntarābhāvaḥ*²² *tadavastha*²³ *eve 'ti*
*lakshanam idam avyabhicaritam*²⁴,

(1) W om (2) G M *labhēdavy* (3) G M *arthah* (4) W *ākāravakārap-*
5 G M *ekamātranantaratva* (6) G M om (7) B om (8) G M *ekaratu-* (9) G M
om (10) W *muttarām* (11) G M *ādau* (12) G M *thyatvam* (13) G M *sva-*
14 W *-haratva-*, B *-tvabh*, G M *nan tu ābh* (15) G M *vyavudhānas-*
16 G M om (17) G M *-rābhyaṁ uti* (18) G M *van* (19) G M *na prthagoshtha-*
samhāratā (20) W *u*, B om (21) W B om (22) G M *-vāt* (23) W *sthay*, B
14 G M *vyabh-*

merous, but less frequent I have collected the following (without exhausting the Sanhitā, especially of themes in *ya*) *āgrīya* (iv 5 5²), *aghnyā* (i 1 1), *āgnyā* (ii 2 12⁸), *asmadhīyañc* (i 4 21), *īdhriyā* (iv 5 7²), *dhīshnyā* (iii 1 3¹), *pā'triyā* (iii 2 3³), *budhniyā* (i 3 3), *rēshmiyā* (iv 5 7²), *viçvāpsniyā* (i 5 3³), *viçvadhīyañc* (i 7 13³), *vr'shnyā* (iii 2 5³), *ç'i'ghriyā* (iv 5 5²), *sadhriyāñc* (i 2 14⁵), and, of oblique cases from themes in *i* or *ī*, *ind āgnyāñc* (i 3 12), *gāyatrīyā* (iii 2 9¹), *pā'rshniyā* (iv 6 9²), *pr'çnyā* (ii 2 11⁴), *rd'triyā* (iv 4 1¹), *lakshmiyā* (ii 1 5²), *viçpātmiyā* (iii 1 11⁴), *svādhiyam* (i 3 14⁶). None of the consonantal combinations which are thus avoided by the resolution of the *u* are such as the euphony of the Tāttariyakas does not tolerate but of those which are avoided by the resolution of the *i*, only three are met with in the text—namely, *try* (e g i 8 22¹ ii 4 3¹), *tny* (iv 4 2²), and *çny* (v 5 6³). I have not entered deeply enough into the investigation to deduce the law, if law there be, by which the resolution is made

अकारार्धमैकारौकारयोरादिः ॥ २६ ॥

26 The beginning of *āi* and *āu* is half an *a*

Rules 28 and 29, below, tell of what constitutes the remainder of these diphthongs

संवृतकरणतरमेकेषाम् ॥ २७ ॥

27 Which, in the opinion of some, is uttered with the organs more closed

We have here another indication that, as intimated above (under ii 12), our Prātigākhya does not recognize the close or neutral pronunciation of the short *a*, for, if it did so, there would obviously be no reason for referring to the opinion held by certain authorities respecting its assumption of that utterance in diphthongal combination. Some phonetists (without sufficient reason, as it appears to me) have in like manner defined the first element in our English diphthongs ("long *i*" in *aisle*, *isle*, and *ou* or *ow* in *house*, *down*, to be the neutral vowel (*u* in *but*), rather than the open *a* (of *far*). But, whatever may have been the case with the Sanskrit diphthongs, our own cannot be truly described as composed of two elements each—they are slides, and to allow the organs to remain in

26 *ākārasyāu* "kārasya cā "dir akārārdham bhavati akārasyā 'rdham akārārdham

27 *saṁnīdhyād akārārdham iti labhyate ekeshām mate tat akārārdham samvrtakaranaturam bhavati samvrtāni samvrtksh tāni karāni yasya tat samvrtakaranam atīcayena sanvrtā karanam samvrtakaranaturam*

B reads *sanvrtā* throughout

either their first or last position long enough to make the initial or final element distinctly audible, would be an error of pronunciation.

The commentator glosses *samvṛta*, 'enveloped, shut up, closed,' with *sannikṛṣṭa*, 'drawn down together, approximated'

इकारा ऽध्यर्धः पूर्वस्य शेषः ॥ २८ ॥

28 Of the former, the rest is one and a half times *u*

Of the former—that is, of *āi*, *āi* and *āu* having been mentioned together in a preceding rule (u 26), says the commentator

उकारस्तूत्रस्य ॥ २९ ॥

29 But, of the latter, *u*

That is to say, the remainder of *āu* is one and a half times *u*. To account for the word "but" (*tu*) in the rule, the commentator notes that, as the beginning of both diphthongs is the same sound, *a*, it might seem to follow that their end would be the same sound, *i*; this the "but" denies. This explanation merely intensifies and makes too precise the actual meaning of the word.

For the teachings of the other Prātiśākhya as to the pronunciation of *āi* and *āu*, see the note to Ath Pr 140. As there remarked, the euphonic treatment which they receive proves their first element to have had originally more than a half-mora of quantity. If they must be limited to two moras, a better description of them would have been $1\frac{1}{2}a + \frac{1}{2}i$, and $1\frac{1}{2}a + \frac{1}{2}u$. If, as we may presume to be the case, the authors of these treatises defined their own pronunciation pretty accurately, then the *āi* and *āu*, not less than the *e* and *o*, had by their time taken on a value notably different from that which belonged to them when the euphonic rules of the language were the faithful representation of living processes.

अनुस्वारोत्तमा अनुनासिकाः ॥ ३० ॥

30 *Anusvāra* and the last mutes are nasal

As example of *anusvāra*, the comment cites *yo 'ñṣum* (iii 3 4³),

28 *pārvasyāi* "kārasye 'ty arthah adhastād' ākārāṅkārāṅyoh sahoocaritatvāt" *adhyardha* *ikāra* *ākārasya* *ṣeṣho bhavati* *adhikam ardham yasyā* 'sāv *adhyardhah*

¹ W *adhyardhas tāvad* ² G M *uccar-*

29. *uttarasyāu* "kārasye 'ty arthah *adhyardha* *ikāra* *ākāra* *ṣeṣho* *bhuvati* *yathā* 'nayoṛ ubhayor apy ādir *ākāra* *eva tad-* *vad* *ikāra* *eva ṣeṣah* ² *piśaktah* *tam* ³ *nishedhati tuṣābdah*.

¹ G M *-rasya ṣe* ² W B *om* ³ W B *am*

of the "last" or nasal mutes, *pratyāñ hotāram* (VI 3 1⁵)—to which G M add *prāñcam upa* (V 2 7³), and *manind* (VI 3 14)

The term *anunāsika* is interpreted by the commentator as signifying *nāsikām anuvartate*, 'it goes after the nostril'—that is to say, doubtless, 'it finds exit by the nasal passages' an accurate definition of this class of sounds. As employed in this *Pratigākhya*, *anunāsika* means simply, as adjective, 'nasal,' and its derivative noun, *ānunāsikya*, signifies 'nasality, nasal utterance'. Rule 52, below, describes how such mode of utterance is produced, and in chapter XVII (rules 1-4) is made an attempt to define the degree of nasality in the various sounds of the class. "Nasal," or *anunāsika*, by the present rule, are the *anusvāra* and the five nasal mutes, *ñ, ñ, n, n, m*, the same term is applied later to the nasal semivowels into which *n* and *m* (V 26-28) are under certain circumstances convertible, and at V 31, X 11, XV 1, 6, XXII 14, we also hear of nasal (*anunāsika*) vowels. The other nose-sounds, the *yamas* and *nāsikya* (II 49, 50, XXI 8, 12-14), do not anywhere receive this title.

It is desirable to put together somewhere a comprehensive statement of the doctrines held by the *Tāttiriya-Pratigākhya* respecting the nasal constituents of the alphabet it recognizes, and no more suitable place is likely to present itself than is offered here.

All nasal (*anunāsika*) sounds are uttered (II 52) by the mouth and nose together. An *uttama*, a "last" or nasal mute, is a sound in the production of which the intonated breath escapes through the nose, while the organs of the mouth form one of those same contacts which give rise to the corresponding non-nasal mutes of the series. In *anusvāra*, on the other hand (including under that designation the nasal semivowels, of which more further on), the mouth-organs are not wholly closed, but the intonated breath finds exit through them at the same time that it passes through the nasal cavities. In all cases, then, in which the character of the nasal of a syllable is determined by that of the following consonant, the nasal will be a mute if the latter is a mute, but an *anusvāra* if succeeded by a letter not forming a contact—by a semivowel or a spirant. Respecting the phonetic character and occurrence of the nasal mutes, there has been no difference of opinion, so far as we have any information, among the Hindu phonetists of the period represented by the *Pratigākhyas*, none of them has allowed a final *anusvāra* before a pause, or an *anusvāra* before a mute, either in the same or a following word. As to the phonetic value, however, of the real *anusvāra*, the nasal uttered with open mouth-organs, there was by no means the same accordance among those ancient grammarians. Some held it to be a pervading nasalization of the preceding vowel, others, a nasal addition to

30 *anusvāraḥ co 'ttamāḥ cā 'nundāsikā bhavanī nāsikām anuvartanta ity anunāsikāḥ yathā anusvārah yo.... uttamāḥ ca* ¹ *pra----* ² *prā----* *man-*²

¹ G M ms *yathā* ² W B om

that vowel. The former view is adopted and consistently maintained by the Atharva-Prātiçākhyā, which acknowledges nasal consonants and nasalized vowels, but no *tertium quid*. The Prātiçākhyas of the Rik and White Yajus are equally consistent in their recognition of an *anusvāra* as nasal appendage to the vowel, and the latter of them gives (Vāj. Pr. iv 147-8) detailed directions as to the quantity belonging to each element. The Tāttirīya Prātiçākhyā adopts prevailingly the same view, but lets the other appear distinctly in some of its rules. Thus, at v 31, it is stated to be Ātreya's opinion that, when a nasal mute becomes *l*, the preceding vowel is nasalized, and, in conformity with this, xv 1 directly teaches that, after the various conversion of *m* and *n*, the vowel before them becomes nasal, the following rules adding (xv 2,3) that some authorities deny this, and direct *anusvāra* to be inserted instead. Here the commentary has to reverse the obvious intent of the text, and declare the latter rules approved, and the first disapproved. Further, x 11 directs that when a vowel is combined with a nasalized vowel the result is nasal (the commentary, however, gives a different interpretation see the rule). Once more, in xxii 14, among "heavy" syllables is reckoned one that is *anundāsika*, 'nasal'.

I very much doubt whether this difference of views is founded upon an actual difference of pronunciation, it is probably due rather to a discordant apprehension and analysis of a single mode of utterance. The same point might divide into two parties our phonetists at the present day—just as they have long been divided upon the question whether a *b* differs from a *p* in being sonant, or in being soft, or weak, or of inferior aspiration, or something of that kind. Without entering into any detailed discussion of the subject, I will simply say that I incline to side with the Atharvan school, and to believe in nasal vowels rather than in *anusvāra*. No one of the Prātiçākhyas gives an intelligible definition of the phonetic character of *anusvāra*, considered as an independent alphabetic element, if it is to be so considered, we shall hardly be able to make of it anything but a bit of the neutral vowel (*u* of *but*) nasalized, or the sound of the French *un*, and shall have to regard it as attached to the vowel much in the same way as, by us who speak English, the same sound not nasalized is attached to most of our long vowels before an *n*—for example, in *there*, *here*, *oar*, *cure*, *fine*, *sour* (see Journ. Am. Or. Soc'y, viii 353).

Which of the two views is originally favored by the Devanagari alphabet does not admit of much question, the writing of *amṇa*, for example,* with a nasal sign over the vowel of the first syllable, is an unequivocal recognition of the nasality as something affecting the vowel itself. If it had seemed to the framers of this alphabet to be a something interposed between the vowel and the following consonant, they would doubtless have

* Namely, अंश, or अँश

found for it a sign to stand between those of the other elements. This has actually been done, out of a true regard for consistency, by the writers of the Vājasaneyi and Taittirīya texts for lack of a better device, they have brought down one of the usual signs of nasality from above the syllable to a position between the syllables, giving it an addition which enables it to maintain its place there—in the Taittirīya texts, we have the dotted crescent, with the *vrāma*, the usual mark for a consonant not graphically combined with a following consonant, beneath it. The scribes of the Rig-Veda seem to have been less solicitous to make their practice square with their theory. It may well be made a question, however, whether the habit, now so common, of writing *amka*, *amta*, *ambā*, for *aṅka*, *anta*, *ambā*, etc.,† could have grown up until the opinion had become prevalent that the nasal sign in *amṣa* also represented a nasal sound which followed the vowel, and was accommodated in its special mode of utterance to its successor ‡

One more point in the theory of the nasal sounds calls for notice. The assimilation of *n* to a following *l*, and of *m* to a following *l*, *y*, or *v* (v 26-8), is treated by the Taittirīya, the Vājasaneyi, and the Rik Prātiçākhyas as resulting in the production, not of *anusvāra*, but of a nasal counterpart to the semivowel—that is, the case is made analogous with that of a nasal before a mute, instead of before a spirant. Here, also, the Atharva-Prātiçākhyā pursues an independent course, and accepts no nasal *y* or *v*, but only a nasal *l*, as product of both *m* and *n* (see Ath Pr 11 35). In this case, as well as in the other, we have to assume merely a difference in the theoretical explanation of an identical mode of pronunciation, and I should not only favor the Atharvan view, but should be willing to give up the nasal *l* itself, as not worth distinguishing from an ordinary case of *anusvāra*—or of nasalized vowel, if we accept this understanding of the matter. Thus much, indeed, may be allowed—that, while the absence of sonant utterance in the spirants cuts them off from sharing in a nasal quality, it might be difficult to prevent the nasality of the preceding vowel from infecting at least

* Thus, for अंश or अंश, the Vaj S writes अंश, the Taitt S अंश

† That is, अंक, अंत, अंबा, for अङ्क, अन्त, अम्बा

‡ No valid objection can be raised against the practically so convenient, imitation of this habit on the part of modern European scholars, so far as concerns the representation of an original *m* assimilated to a following consonant. To go farther than this, however, and write the *anusvāra* sign in the interior of a word for a nasal mute which is equally radical or thematic with the succeeding non nasal, and, yet more, to write it for a final *m*, which no Prātiçākhyā allows to be pronounced otherwise than *m*, seems an indefensible practice, and one wholly to be disapproved and rejected. Of Muller's seemingly elaborate defense of his adherence to it, given in the Preface to his *Hitopadeça*, absolutely the whole point lies in the phrases (p xi) "it is easier to write *amkātā* than *ankātā*. What applies to writing applies with still greater force to printing"—which latter consideration must be pronounced destitute of weight, since, on the contrary, we *do* expect our printing to be superior in accuracy to ordinary writing.

the beginning of the sonant semivowels. For the exclusion of *r* from the same treatment with the other semivowels I can discover no good reason.

The usage of the manuscripts is pretty nearly in accordance with the theories of the Prāṭiśākhya. For an assimilated *m*, the distinctive *anusvāra* sign is always written before *r*, as before the spirants, but before *l*, *y*, and *v* is written the sign of nasality above the preceding syllable, as before a mute. But as regards *n* before *l*, my manuscript varies with complete irregularity between treating it like *m*, as required by the Prāṭiśākhya, and writing the *n* unchanged, either with *vīrdma* or conjoined with the *l* (instances of the latter mode of treatment are about twice as frequent as of the former). The edited text more usually follows a third method, supported neither by my manuscript nor by the Prāṭiśākhya: it writes the *l* double, and puts a sign of nasality over the preceding syllable. This is nonsense if two *l*'s are written, the first should be separated from the other, and should have the sign of nasality written above it. But there is no reason why this should be done in the case of a combination of *l* with *n* any more than with *m*, or than in the combination of *m* with *y* and *v*.

It only remains to add that, in my manuscripts (T and W) and those at Berlin and Oxford (B and O), the text of the Prāṭiśākhya follows, in regard to the treatment of the nasals as to other points of euphony, the usages of the Tāttirīya text, and that the citations from the latter in the commentary are also written accordingly, while the body of the commentary itself follows the methods of ordinary Sanskrit texts. In this edition, therefore, their example is followed as closely as possible: the proper *anusvāra* being represented by ṅ, and the *m* assimilated to a mute or semivowel, by *m*. The two South-Indian manuscripts (G and M) do not distinguish these two from one another.

स्वराणां यत्रोपसंस्कारस्तत्स्यानम् ॥३१॥

31. In the case of the vowels, that is their place of production, to which approximation is made.

The term *upasamhāra*, 'approximation,' is glossed by *upaśleṣa-vigrahaḥ*, 'a sort of embrace'—unless, indeed, we are to read, with G and M, *saṁśleṣavigrahaḥ*, 'disunion of embrace,' i. e., 'embrace which does not come to actual contact.'

The terms *sthāna*, 'place,' and *kāraṇa*, 'organ,' denote, as in the other Prāṭiśākhyas (see note to Ath. Pr. 1.18), the more passive and the more active of the two parts of the mouth whose concurrence gives birth to a sound.

31 *svarānāṁ tat sthānam bhavati¹ yatro² pasamhārah syāt upasamhāro nāmo³ paśleṣavigrahaḥ³*

¹ B om ² W 'paśleṣ', G M *saṁśleṣavigrahaḥ*

यदुपसंहरति तत्करणम् ॥ ३२ ॥

32 That is producing organ, which makes the approximation

Here, "in the case of the vowels" is declared to be implied from the preceding rule, *upasamharati*, 'approaches,' is explained by *prāpayati*, 'attains,' and, as example of a *karana*, or producing organ, reference is made to the "tip of the tongue," spoken of in rule 18 of this chapter

अन्येषां तु यत्र स्पर्शनं तत्स्थानम् ॥ ३३ ॥

33 But in the case of the other letters, that is place of production, where contact is made

By this expression, the commentator says, simple embrace or union is predicated of the consonants, while above a sort of embrace (or disunion of embrace) was predicated of the vowels. The difference, he adds, between approximation and contact will be inferred by any knowing person from the force of the terms themselves. The word "but" (*tu*) is meant to exclude the vowels, or, as Māhishya explains it, annuls for *anusvāra* and *svanabhakti* the quality of being produced by contact merely, like the other consonants. This last is a precious bit of pregnant construction, and the whole comment is more obscure than the rule itself, whose meaning and implication are sufficiently obvious

येन स्पर्शयति तत्करणम् ॥ ३४ ॥

34 That is producing organ, whereby one makes the contact

The commentator supplies, as subject of the verb, the noun *adhyetā*, 'reader'—or, rather, 'repeater'

32 *svarānām iti sāmādhyaḥ labhyate svarānām tat karanam bhavati yat svarām upasamharati prāpayati 'tat karanam' yathā jihvāgram rkāra (11 18) ity ādi*

¹ B *tat sthanam*, G M om

33 *svanebhyo 'nyeshām varnānām tat sthānam yatra sparśanam bhavet atra vyāñjanānām saṃgleshmātram¹ kathiyate svarānām tu² purastāt saṃgleshah³ kathitah upasamhārasparśanayoh⁴ śabdāśaktyā viśesho⁵ viduṣhā vijñeyah⁶ tuśabdah⁷ svaranvrttyarthah athavā⁸ anusvārasvarabhaktyor vyāñjanavāt⁹ sparśanamātrakatvanivānata¹⁰ iti māhishyabhāṣhitam*

¹ W *ślosh*, G M *-mātratvam* ² W om ³ G *-śaṃgleshah*, M *śaṃgleshah* ⁴ G M *-hāra iti sparśana* ⁵ G M ms *eva* ⁶ G M *jñātavyah* ⁷ G M *śabda* ⁸ G M om ⁹ W *-nave*, B *na* ¹⁰ B *sparśakamnama*, G M *sparśamatrahālam* *nav*, M *-vartata*

In these four rules is implied that distinction of opener and closer position between vowel and consonant which constitutes their essential difference (see Jouin Am Oī Soc'y, viii 367 seq.), and which the Ath Pr states more fully (1 29–35 —where, in rule 33, we should read *eke* 'sprshtam'), with specifications of degree of openness and closure which are here omitted (save so far as represented by rule 45, below)

हन्मूले जिह्वामूलेन कवर्गे स्पर्शयति ॥ ३५ ॥

35 In the *k* series, one makes contact with the root of the tongue at the root of the jaws

Compare Ath Pr 1 20, and the references to the other Prāṭiśākhyas there given

The locative and instrumental cases, in this and the following rules, correspond with the *yatra*, 'where,' and *yena*, 'whereby,' of rules 33 and 34, above, and point out respectively the place and organ of production of the different classes of sounds

The singular number of *hanūmāla*, 'root of the jaws,' the commentator accounts for as used generically (*jātyapekshāyām*, 'with reference to the whole kind or class')

तालौ जिह्वामध्येन चवर्गे ॥ ३६ ॥

36 In the *c*-series, with the middle of the tongue, upon the palate

Compare Ath Pr 1 21, and the note upon it The sonant aspirate of this series, *ṣh*, is not met with in the text

जिह्वेण प्रतिवेद्य मूर्धनि टवर्गे ॥ ३७ ॥

37 In the *t* series, with the tip of the tongue, rolled back, in the head.

Compare Ath Pr 1 22, and the note upon it Our commentary says, "by the word 'head' (*mārdhan*) is intended the upper part

34 *sāmnadhyād anyeshām itī labhyate svarebhyo 'nyeshām varnānām tat karanam bhavati adhyetā yena vyañjunāni sparṣayati prāpayati tat karanam*

35 *ḥavarga uccāryamāne jihvāmūleṇa¹ hanūmāle sparṣayati prāpayet ity arthah hanvor mūlam hanūmūlan² tasmin³ 4 jātyapekshāyām⁵ ekavacanam*

¹ G M ins *varnam* ² B G M om ³ W B om ⁴ G M ins *mūlam itī* ⁵ W -*śham*

36 *ṣavarge kārye¹ jihvāmadhyena² varnān³ tālāu sprṣet⁴.*

¹ G M put *tālāu* here ² M -*nam* ³ B *sprṣayet*, G M *sparṣayet*.

of the mouth-cavity” Perhaps we shall best remove the difficulties attaching to the use of the word “head” in describing this class of sounds, by assuming that the name *mūrdhanya*, ‘capital,’ had become firmly established in use as designating them, at an earlier period of phonetic science in India, when their mode of production was less accurately understood and defined, and was therefore retained by the later grammarians, who gave to it a new definition. For, that *mūrdhan* should have been taken directly and without ceremony to signify the ‘dome of the palate’ does not appear to me possible. As in the notes to the Atharva-Prātiśākhya, I shall take the liberty of speaking of the *t*-sounds as “lingual”—a term, on the whole, as unobjectionable and as commonly accepted as any other.

The commentator glosses the word *pratīveshtya*, ‘having rolled it back,’ by “having done what? having rolled back (G M add in explanation *āveshtya*, ‘having rolled up’) the tip of the tongue, on account of its suitability” (i e of the adaptedness of this position to produce the contact aimed at)

निष्वायेण तवर्गे दन्तमूलेषु ॥ ३८ ॥

38 In the *t*-series, with the tip of the tongue, at the roots of the teeth

Compare Ath Pr 1 24, and the note upon it

ओष्ठान्यां पवर्गे ॥ ३९ ॥

39 In the *p* series, with the two lips

The commentator explains that here the upper lip is the place of production, as the various places of production mentioned have been the upper organ, and that the under lip is the organ of production

Compare Ath Pr 1 25, and the note upon it

37 *tavarge kārye jīhvāgrena* ¹ *mūrdhna* ² *varnam spr̥ṣet* ³ *kim krtvā* *yogyatvā* ⁴ *jīhvāgram pratīveshtya* ⁵ *mūrdhna* *ṣabdena vak-travīnaroparibhāgo vivakshyate* ⁶

¹ G M put *varnam* here ² B G M *mūrdham* ³ B *spr̥ṣayet* ⁴ W *-tva*, B *tvat tat*, G *-tvān*, M *tvāyogyatvān* ⁵ G M *-shtyāveshtya* ⁶ G M *-kshatah*

38 *tavarge kārye jīhvāgrena varnam dantamūleṣu spar̥ṣayet* ¹.

¹ G M *spr̥ṣet*

39 *pavarge kārya oṣṭhābhyām anyonyam spar̥ṣayet atro* ¹ *ttaroṣṭha sthānam uttaratvasāmyād* ² *eshām sthānānām adharoṣṭhaḥ karanam*

¹ W *tatro* ² B *-rātvāt sāmānyād*, G M *oṣṭhatva*

तालौ जिह्वामध्यान्ताभ्यां यकारे ॥ ४० ॥

40 In *y*, with the two edges of the middle of the tongue, upon the palate

The Tāttirīya-Prāticākhya stands alone in omitting to rank the semi-vowels along with the mutes, as palatal, etc., and in describing their formation throughout by special rule. Respecting *y*, see the note to Ath Pr 1 21

The description of the mode of production of *y*, here given, is quite accurate and sufficiently distinctive. The "edges" are mentioned, as being the parts which form contact with the palate, the central part remaining open, as taught for *ṛ* in rule 22, above

रेफे जिह्वाग्रमध्येन प्रत्यग्दन्तमूलेभ्यः ॥ ४१ ॥

41 In *r*, with the middle of the tip of the tongue, back of the roots of the teeth

Pratyak is explained by the phrase, "in the interior upper portion"—that is, 'within and above'—the equivalence of *pratyagātman* and *antarātman*, 'inner soul,' being pleaded as justification

The somewhat discordant teachings of the Prāticākhyas with reference to this sound are detailed in the note to Ath Pr 1 28. The most noteworthy circumstance in their common treatment of the letter is that they so ignore its special relationship with the lingual mutes, and in part with the *r*-vowels although in this treatise the definition of the latter (11 18) is, essentially, nearly accordant with that here given for the semivowel. *R* could not possibly have the value which belongs to it in the Sanskrit euphonic system, if it were not a lingual semi-vowel, like the English *r*, uttered with the tip of the tongue reverted into the dome of the palate

दन्तमूलेषु च लकारे ॥ ४२ ॥

42 Also in *l*, at the roots of the teeth

According to the commentator, the "and" (*ca*) of this rule brings down by implication from the preceding both *jihvāgramadhya*, 'middle of the tongue-tip,' and *pratyak*, 'back from' It

40 *yakāre kārye jīhvāmadhyāntābhyām tālāu sparśayet jīhvāyā madhyam tasyā 'ntāu tābhyām jīhvāmadhyāntābhyām*¹.

¹ G M om

41 *rephe kārye jīhvāgramadhyena dantamūlebhyaḥ pratyak sparśayet pratyag ity 'abhyantara uparibhāga' ity arthah 'yah pratyagātme 'ty' antarātmā pratiyate*

(1) G M *ntaropari* (2) G M *yathā pratyagātmanā*

appears obvious, however, if only from the locative case of *dantamūleshu*, that the latter item is not intended, and that we are to regard the roots of the teeth themselves (more properly, the gums close upon them) as the *sthāna*, or 'place of production,' of *l*. This, indeed, is nearly enough intimated by the final paraphrase of the comment. The really distinctive characteristic of the *l*, that it forms a contact in front, but allows the breath to escape at the sides of the tongue, is here by no means clearly brought out; rather, we are left to infer that it and the *r* are produced in the same manner, only the *r* a little further back. No one of the other treatises gives a better description (see note to Ath Pr 1 24, where I have given the Tāttiriya definition more credit than really belongs to it).

अष्टान्ताभ्यां दन्तैर्वकारे ॥ ४३ ॥

43 In *v*, with the edges of the lips, along with the teeth

This rule cannot be commended for distinctness. The commentator gives it not a little of additional precision, by his paraphrase "with the two edges of the lower lip, along with the points of the upper teeth". But how comes the lower lip to have two edges? He adds, that the teeth are the place, and the lips the organ, of production. But then why does not the rule read *danteshu*, instead of the instrumental *dantāḥ*? It gives us two instrumentals, as if teeth and lips were joint organs, and neither of them any more "place" than the other. The lower lip, being the more passive organ, should be the "place" on which the teeth, as "organ," make their contact, but from taking this view the treatise and its comment appear to be hindered by the analogy of the other *sthāna*'s, which have uniformly been the upper of the two parts concerned in the contact. To make a good definition, the rule should read *adharoshthānte* for *oshthāntābhyām*.

Of the other treatises (as pointed out in the note to Ath Pr 1 25), the Vāj Pr gives the *v* a description corresponding with this, and showing the letter to have had the precise phonetic value of our English *v*. This, of course, should not in the least stand in the way of our fully recognizing the fact that its original sound was that of our *w*. The *w* is a semi-vowel, standing in the same relation to *u* as *y* to *i*, but to call *v* a semi-vowel is a sim-

42 *cakāro jīhvāgramadhyapratyaktvam anvādicati*¹ *lakāre kārye jīhvāgramadhyena*² *dantamūleshu pratyak sparṣayet*³ *ayam arthah lakārasya*⁴ *dantamālapratyāsannam pratyaganta-rapradēcāsthānam*⁵ *iti vyñeyam*⁶

(¹) G. M. *jīhvāmadhyam pratyaktvam ca* "karshati" ² G. M. *hṛdmadh* ³ W. B. put after *vyñeyam* (⁴) G. M. *-sannapradēcā sthānam* ⁵ G. M. *jñeyam*

43 *valakāre kārye dhāroshthāntābhyām uttaradantāgrāḥ saha sparṣayet dantāḥ iti sthānanirdeśah. oshthāntābhyām iti karānanirdeśah.*

ple abuse of terms We might nearly as well call our *y* a semi-vowel, because it is written with an originally vocalic sign, and represents in the majority of cases a sound which the Romans pronounced as *y*

स्पर्शस्थानेषूष्माणान् अनुपूर्व्येण ॥ ४४ ॥

44 The spirants, in their order, are produced in the places of the mutes

By rule 19, there are six spirants, and as there are but five "places" of mutes, these belong to the first five spirants, as is signified by the expression "in their order" *h*, therefore, is omitted, and its rules will be given hereafter (rules 46,47) To this effect the commentator, who also allots the spirants to their respective mute classes, and cites from the Sanhitā an example for each namely, for *jihvāmāliya*, uttered in the place of a *k*-mute, *yah kāmāyeta* (11 3 2⁴ et al I follow the example of all the MSS, and do not attempt to distinguish the guttural and labial spirants from *visarjanīya* by different signs), for *ç*, in the place of a *c*-mute, *madhuç ca mādhuvaç ca* (14 14, or 14 4 11¹ W B omit the last two words of the citation, and W reads *manyuç ca*, which is found at 14 7 2¹), for *sh*, in the place of a *t*-mute, *ashtābhyah svāhā* (11 2 15), for *s*, in the place of a *t*-mute, *stanā uparavāh* (11 2 11⁴), and for *upadhmanīya*, in the place of a *p*-mute, *yah pāpmanā* (11 3 13²)

To make this rule a definition of the mode of utterance of the spirants, the one next following is to be applied to modify it Unfortunately, both together are insufficient to give us any clear idea of the two problematical sounds, *jihvāmāliya* and *upadhmanīya*, and there is room for us to suspect them of being, like the long *h*-vowel, an artificial fabrication of the Hindu grammarians As for the *s*, there is no question as to its value Nor ought there to be respecting that of the *sh*, which both the explanations of the phonetists and the phenomena of Sanskrit euphony show to have been that particular sibilant (more nearly resembling our *sh* than *s*, but sufficiently distinct from either) which is uttered with the tongue reverted into the dome of the palate It passes my comprehension how European grammarians should continue to identify

44 ūshmana ānupūrvyena yathākramena sparśasthāneshū
'ccāranīyā bhavanti yathā jihvāmāliyah kavargasthāne yah
k- çakāraç cavargasthāne¹ madhuç² ---- shakāraśh tavargasthāne
asht- ---- sakāras tavargasthāne stanā ---- upa-
dhmanīyah pavargasthāne yah p- ity ānupūrvyena³ ānupūrvyān⁴
nāyamāt pañcasū⁵ "shmasū 'kteshu hādro vṛṣṣṭah⁵
tasya vidham uparīkṣṭād ācaśhte

¹ W *cavargīyas*, B *çakāras* - ² W *manyuç* ³ G M -vyā vyñeyāh ⁴ G M -vya ⁵ B -peshah, G M *vasishṭah*

it with our *sh*, and, yet more, how that absurd distinction of the lingual and palatal sibilants (of which, so far as I know, Wilson was the originator) which defines the former as the same with our *sh* in *shun*, and the latter with our *ss* in *session*, can still be repeated in the latest Sanskrit grammars. Absurd I call it, because there is really no difference at all between the pronunciation of *sh* in *shun* and *ss* in *session*. If our *sh* be found in the Sanskrit alphabet, it is the palatal sibilant *ç*, not the lingual, *sh*. The question of the value of *ç* is connected with and depends upon that of the palatal series of mutes, and upon this I have nothing more to say than I said in the note to Ath Pr 1 21

करणमध्यं तु विवृतम् ॥ ४५ ॥

45 But the middle of the producing organ is unclosed.

The "but" (*tu*) of this rule, we are told, is intended to annul (so far) the similarity of organ of the spirants with the mutes. This prescription of an unclosure of the middle of the organ is a rather artificial device for saving the credit of the general prescription of actual contact in all the consonants. It is nearly equivalent with the rules of the Ath Pr (1 30, 31) upon the same subject.

कण्ठस्थानौ ह्रकारविसर्जनीयौ ॥ ४६ ॥

46 The throat is place of production of *h* and *visarjanīya*

And, the commentator adds, they have no *karana*, or organ of production. As example of *h*, he cites *aharahar havirdhānām* (u 5 6³), but leaves *visarjanīya* uninstanced.

The other Prātiśākhya's give a corresponding definition of the utterance of these two sounds (see note to Ath Pr 1 19). It is too indefinite to be of any particular use to us in determining their phonetic value. But the two rules which next follow in our treatise are very interesting and instructive.

उद्यस्वरादिसंस्थानो ह्रकार एकेषाम् ॥ ४७ ॥

47 In the opinion of some authorities, *h* has the same position as the beginning of the following vowel.

Our commentator first offers the simple paraphrase of this rule

45 *teshām ūshmanām karanamādhyam tu vṛtam bhavati sparśanām karanasāmīyanvṛtiparas¹ tuṣabdhāḥ karanānām madhyam karanamādhyam*

¹ B -*ttiyartham*

46 *hakaravisarjanīyau kanthasthānau syātām kantha sthānam yayos tām tathoktām anayok karanābhāvaḥ ah----*

which he finds given by one of his three chief authorities, Vararuci, and then proceeds to exhibit his own superior acuteness by a very long, but not very important, discussion of it a loose version is as follows

The expression "the same position as the beginning," etc., implies a difference of position in the remainder of the vowel, but there is none such in *a*, *i*, *u*, as a vowel has but a single position, the word "beginning" is superfluous, and the desired result would be secured by saying simply "of the same position with the vowel" That is not so a difference of position does in fact belong to the remainder of the diphthongs the two rules (u 28, 29) which teach that *i* and *u* form the final elements of *ai* and *au* assure the difference of position for those two sounds, in like manner, a difference of position is to be remarked as prescribed in general grammar [though not in this treatise] for the final elements of *e* and *o*, they being included in the category of diphthongs But again even granting that, the utterance in the throat of this very *a* which makes the initial element of the diphthongs is taught by the rule, "the throat is the place of production of *a*, the *k*-mutes, *h*, and *visarjanīya*," hence, as sameness of position [with the *a*, as throat-sound] is prescribed by the preceding rule, this rule is open to the charge of superfluous repetition You must not think so, is the reply, there is a difference between the *a* which forms the beginning of *e* and *o* and an *a* standing by itself to the latter belongs the description given above in rule 12, "the lips and jaws not too widely separated," etc., to the other, that of rule 27, "with the organ of production more closed," therefore, as place and organ correspond to one another, the expression "of the same position as the beginning" is to be understood as meaning "of the same place and organ as the beginning" Moreover, in the former rule the absence of an organ of production was taught, but here is implied also the presence of such, hence a difference of opinions comes to light, and not merely a superfluous repetition

47 *ekeshām mate hakdra¹ udayasvarādisasthāna ātmana upari svarādisasthāno² bhavati 'ti vārarucoktam³ syād etat ādinā⁴ sasthāna ity ukte geshasya sthānāntaratvam⁵ vaktavyam tad apy akārekhārokdreshu nā 'sti⁶ svarasyāi⁷ kam eva⁸ sthānān⁹ ity ādīgabdhavānyarthīyam syāt svarasasthāna⁹ ity etāvatāi¹⁰ 'vā 'rthasiddhir¹⁰ iti mār¹¹ 'vam sandhyakshareshu geshasya⁸ sthānāntaropapatteh ikāro 'dhyardhah (u 28) iti sūtradhvuyena geshabhātavarnavyaktāu¹¹ tayo¹² sthānāntaram api prasiddham eva evam¹³ ekārādukārāyor api vyākaranē¹⁴ geshasya sthānāntaram vihitam vyñīyam sandhyaksharatvādviceshād anayoh nanv evam apy akūhavisarjanīyānām kantha iti sandhyaksharāddv akārasyā¹⁵ pi kanthasthānatvāt tepa samānasthānatve¹⁵ kathyamāne¹⁶ pūrvasūtroktena¹⁷ pūrnaruktyam asya¹⁸ sūtrasya*

Any detailed criticism of this cunning argument would certainly be open to the charge of superfluity, and I shall not attempt it.

A few further examples of the occurrence of *h*, before the various diphthongs, are added *tigmahete* (1 2 14²), *yāvatiṛ vāśmahār* (vii 5 2¹), *agnihotram juhōti* (1 5 9¹), *samprayatiṛ ahaṇu* (v 6 1²).

The acuteness of observation of the "some authorities" who have made this definition of the character of a *h* certainly deserves respectful, if not admiring, acknowledgment. It is the peculiarity of the aspiration, that it is an emission of unintonated breath through the same position of the mouth-organs by which the following intonated sound receives its character—thus, the *h* of *ha* is a surd *a*, so to speak, that of *he*, a surd *e*, that of *ho*, a surd *u*, that of *hue*, a surd *y*, and so on (see Journ. Am. Or. Soc'y, viii 370 seq.) The rule would have been made better by reading *udayavarna*, instead of *udayasvarādi*—"the following sound," instead of "the beginning of the following vowel"—for the assimilation is not less true of the semi-vowels and nasals than of the vowels.

पूर्वात्तसंस्थानो विसर्जनीयः ॥ ४८ ॥

48 *Visarjanīya* has the same position as the end of the preceding vowel.

The commentator does not tell us whether this definition is to be looked upon as, like the preceding, expressing the opinion of "some authorities," or as having the unqualified approval of the Prātiśākhya. From his silence we should infer the latter, but the connection gives reason for presuming the former. He paraphrases "*visarjanīya* is of like position—that is, of like place and organ—with the end of the vowel that precedes itself," and adds that

*syāt mār 'vam mansthāh ekārāukārādvarāno*¹⁹ *'kārasya kevalasya ca viṣeṣho 'strī kevalasya*²⁰ *karanam osthahanu nā 'tivyastam* (ii 12) *iti*²¹ *sandhyakṣharādāu vartamānasya tu samvrtakaranātaram* (ii 27) *tasmāt sthānakaranayoh saha-caritavādā*²² *ādisasthāna ity ukta ādisamānasthānakarana*²³ *iti vyñeyam kim ca pūrvasūtre karanābhāva ity*²⁴ *uktah atra tu karanavattvam api*²⁵ *vidyata itī matāntaram upapadyate na pūnaruktyam ca tathā*²⁶ *tig- yāv-... agn-... sam-... udyaṣabda uttaraparyāyah*²⁷ *udayaṣ cā 'sāu*²⁸ *svaraṣ ca*²⁹ *tasyā*³⁰ *'dāh tena sasthānah*

¹ G M put before *ekeshām* ² G M *udayasvar-* ³ W B *var-* ⁴ W *dā*
⁵ G M *taram* ⁶ G M ins *tathā satī* ⁽⁷⁾ W *'kasthānam evam* ⁽⁸⁾ B om
⁹ G M *svarasya sa-* ¹⁰ G M om *artha*, G M *-dāher* ¹¹ G M *-bhūtam v-*
¹² G M *tasyā* ¹³ G M om ¹⁴ G M *-na* ¹⁵ G M *sthā-* ¹⁶ G M *kalpy*
¹⁷ G M *-vok-* ¹⁸ G M *eva tasya* ¹⁹ G M *-rayor dā* ²⁰ W ins *tu* ²¹ G M
²² *nā 'tyupāsamhritam ca*, B no *'pasamhritam* ²³ W B *-rūvād* ²⁴ W *-sthāna*
²⁵ G M om ²⁶ G M om ²⁷ G M *udayasvarādisasthānah*
²⁸ G M om. *asāu* ²⁹ G M ins *udayasvarāh*

here too the language of the rule is aimed at the diphthongs, since no other vowel exhibits any difference of position between its end and its beginning. His examples, again, are only of *visarjanīya* after a diphthong: they are *agneh* (1.1 10³ et al), *brāhmanān āyushmat* (1.3 10³), *bāhuvor balam* (v 5 9²), and *ā'yam gāruh* (1.5 3¹). In the second and third of these passages, only the first word should have been quoted, in order to exhibit the *visarjanīya*.

The teachings of the other Prāṭicākhyas respecting the *visarjanīya* are rehearsed in the note to Ath Pr 1.19. All are so indefinite as really to teach us nothing respecting the phonetic value of the sound. The present rule alone gives us positive and precise information, teaching us to regard it as, like the *h*, a simple uncharacterized breathing, a kind of final *h*.

नासिक्या नासिकास्थानाः ॥ ४९ ॥

49 The nose-sounds have the nose as their place of production.

The "nose-sounds," the commentary says, are the *yamas* (xxi 12, 13), but why the *nāsikya* (xxi 14) should not be regarded as included among them I do not see. Any discussion of their phonetic character may be best deferred until the chapter where the rules for their occurrence are given. As examples of the nose-sounds are quoted *rukman antaram* (v 1 10³ but G M B give instead *rukmantam*, 1.2 3³), *yācñā* (1.5 7⁴ but G M give instead *rājñā*, 1.6 2² et al), *ānārah* (v 6 5³), *ratnam abhayaṇta* (1.6 12¹ but G M give instead, if it be not merely a corrupted reading, *uccā ratnam ayayanta*, which I have not found in the Sanhitā), and *pāpmanam* (1.4 41 et al).

मुखनासिक्या वा ॥ ५० ॥

50 Or they are produced by the mouth and nose.

Respecting this alternative explanation nothing need be said at present.

48 *visarjanīya ātmanah pūrvasvarāntena sasthānah samānasthānakarano bhavati atrā'pi pūrvasvara iti sandhyaksharam ucyate svarāntarasya¹ hi² sthānāntaratvābhāvāt yathā ag³ brāh----- bāh-----⁴ ā----- pūrvasyā'ntah tena sasthānah pūrvāntasasthānah⁵*

¹ W B *ntasya* ² B *om*, G M *bhūna* ³ B *om* ⁴ B *om* ⁵ B *om*

49 *nāsikyā yamā nāsikāsthānā bhavanti yathā ruk----- yā- āt- rat----- pāp-*

50 *ta¹ eva nāsikyā mukhanāsikābhyām² uccā anīyā bhavanti mukham ca nāsikā³ ca mukhanāsike⁴ tatsambandhino mukhanāsikyā⁵ uktāny evo 'dāharanāni⁵*

¹ G M *eta* ² G M *mukhena nāsikābhyām* ca ³ G M *ke* ⁴ G M *-kam*
(⁵) G M but after *bhavanti*

वर्गवच्चैषु ॥ ५१ ॥

51 And, in them, the organ of production is as in the series of mutes

The "and" (*ca*) of this rule, the commentator says, brings forward, on the principle of 'the lion's look' (a distant glance backward the phrase is used several times later in like cases), the already defined organs of production of the various mute series

If the mouth be regarded as bearing a part in the production of the nose-sounds or *yamas*, in a way which is determined by the mode of formation of the mutes to which they are attached, it is difficult to see how their number can be restricted to four, as it is in the "list of sounds" given at the beginning of the treatise, and in the comment on rule XXI 12

नासिकाविवरणादानुनासिक्यं नासिकाविवरणादानु- नासिक्यम् ॥ ५२ ॥

52 Nasal quality is given by the unclosing of the nose

Ānundāsikya is the quality of being *anundāsika* or 'nasal,' and this name, as prescribed by rule 30, above, and fully supported by the usage of the treatise elsewhere, belongs to *anusvāra* and the various nasal consonants. The definition of the manner in which the quality is communicated is quite unexceptionable, the organs of the mouth remaining in the positions already given for the various classes and single sounds, the opening of the nasal passage, and the utterance through it of a part or the whole of the emitted material, makes the corresponding nasal sound

The commentator explains *nāsikāvivarana* by *ghrānābila*, 'hole of the nose, nasal passage,' as if *vivarana* signified the opening or cavity, instead of the act of opening or unclosing. His choice of an example also seems to betray a want of appreciation of the true scope of the rule. It is *suślokaśāṣṇa* *sumāṅgalāśāṣṇa* (18 16²)

51 *svāhāvalokanena*¹ *vargasyo* 'ktam *karanam cakāro* 'nikar-
shatā *eshu*² *nāsikyeshu* *vargavat karanam bhavati* *vargasye*
va *vargavat*

¹ G M *kanāmyāyena* ² G M (as also in the text of the rule itself) *eteshu*

52. *nāsikāvivaranaād ghrānābilād ānundāsikyam raṅgādā kar-*
*tavyam yathā*³ *suś-*---- *ity ādi*

iti tribhāṣhyaratne prātiśādhyaṅgavarane
dvitīyo 'dhyāyah

¹ G M *nāsikāb-* ² B *taithā*, W om

CHAPTER III

CONTENTS 1, introductory, 2-6, cases of *ā* at the end of the first member of a compound, requiring to be shortened in divided text, 7, of *i* and *u*, 8-12, of final *a* of verbal forms and particles, 13-14, of final *i* and *u*, 15, of initial *a*

अथादावुत्तरे विभागे ऋस्वं व्यञ्जनपरः ॥ १ ॥

1 Now then—at the beginning or end of a word, a vowel, in case of separation, if followed by a consonant, becomes short as hereinafter set forth

Matters of introductory explanation, of interpretation of the rules of the treatise, and of phonetic theory, being now for the present disposed of (for they are resumed, in a supplementary way, in some of the concluding chapters), the task of determining the readings of the *Sanhitā* is taken up. And the first subject dealt with is that of the irregular prolongations of vowels—chiefly final *a*, *i*, and *u*—which are so frequent in all the Vedic texts. In the other treatises (*Rik* P1 vii-ix, *Vāj* Pr iii 95-128, *Ath* Pr iii.1-25), the rules tell us in what situations a vowel originally short is lengthened: this is more in accordance with the general method of the *Prāticākhyas*, which take for granted, upon the whole, the existence of their *pākhās* in the analyzed condition of the *padā*-text, and proceed to construct the *samhitā* from it. Here, on the contrary, we are told what vowels, long in the ordinary text, are to be shortened when thrown out of combination with their surroundings. Such dissolution of the continuity of the text takes place, first, in *pada*, whenever a pause—either the *avagraha* separating the two members of a compound, in its repetition after *iti*, or the longer pause that divides between two words—comes to stand between the vowel in question and the consonant which was its next neighbor in *samhitā*: thus, *devāyata iti deva-yate*, *avanah* (s *avā nah*). Second, it is made in the so-called *jatā*-text, examples of which are often quoted in the sequel, and to which the rules of the treatise are in more than one instance adapted, thus text is constructed by thrice repeating each pair of words—first in

1 *athe 'ty ayam adhikārah ādāu padādāv uttare padānte ca vartumānah samhitāyām yo dīrgho 'sāu vibhāge vibhāgasamayā vyāñyanaparo hrasvam āpadyate* ¹ *vyāñyanaparatvam* ² *atra yathāsamhitāsthānā vyññeyam nanu dīrghah katham labhyate* ³ *hrasvānantarābhāvitvād devāçikā* (III 2) ⁴ *dagrahameṣu plutādarçanāc ce* ⁵ *'ti brāmah samhitāyām ity asyā 'yam arthah* ⁶ *kāryābhāgah padasyo 'ttarapadena saha sambandhanvyamah* ⁷ *'na tu pūrvapadena saha sambandhanvyamah* ⁸ *vibhāgo 'tra*

their natural order, then inverted, then in the natural order again for example, *āpo hi sthā mayobhuvah* would become *āpo hi hy āpa āpo hi hi sthā sthā hi hi sthā sthā mayobhuvā mayobhuvā sthā sthā mayobhuvah mayobhuvā iti mayābhuvah* the treatment of the *ā* of *sthā* here illustrates the conditions of the restoration of the short vowel in such cases. Third, the same restoration takes place in the *samhitā*-text of the existing manuscripts and in the edition founded upon them, when the lengthened vowel happens to come at the end of one of those passages, of just fifty words each, into which the *anuvākas* or sections of the *Sanhitā* are divided. This division the *Prāṭisākhya* does not recognize—or, at any rate, does not notice—not infrequently quoting in *sandhi*, without remark, words which are separated by it (for example, under rule 13, below, *uḡmasi gamadhye*, 13 6¹⁻², where the edited text reads correctly *uḡmasi 1 gamadhye*).

The comment upon this rule may be loosely translated, or paraphrased, as follows

Here *atha*, 'now then,' is an introductory heading, *ādāu* [literally, 'at the beginning'] means 'at the beginning of a word' [including, also, a separable part of a compound word], *uttare* [literally, 'in the latter part'] means 'at the end of a word' a vowel occupying such a position, if it be long in *samhitā*, becomes short *vibhāge*, i e 'in case of separation,' when followed by a consonant—that is to say, when so followed in *samhitā*. But whence is derived the limitation to a "long" vowel? We answer, from its conversion into a short, and from the non-occurrence of any protracted (*phata*) vowels among the instances included in the rules. The limitation "in *samhitā*" implies that the word whose form is in question is placed in euphonic connection with the word that follows it, not, however, with the word that precedes it [unless, as should be excepted, its initial vowel, instead of its final, is the one liable to change of quantity]. "Separation" (*vibhāga*) is to be understood as division from the words with which it stands in natural or original connection—that is, according to the reading of the fundamental text. Otherwise, in the *ajāṭ*-text of the two words *sthā mayobhuvah* (see above), the *stha* would retain its long *ā* in its second repetition, because of its standing in euphonic connection with the following word and that should not be so. The sense of the word *vibhāga* is, in case of a long initial vowel, separation from the preceding word, in case of a long final, from the

*prakṛtipadāu ucyate prakṛtir nāna yathāpāthah prakṛtipadāu
iti kun sthā m- ity atra jāṭyām sthagābdasya dvitīyocārane
'pi dīrghah prasajyeta' uttarapadāna vibhāgābhāvāt sa⁸ mā
bhūd iti parihārah vibhāgapadasyā⁹ 'yam arthah padādāu¹⁰
dīrghasya pūrvapadāna vibhāgah padānte¹¹ dīrghasyo 'ttarapa-
dāna vibhāgah vibhāge vyañjanapara iti kun rt-... ity atra
mā bhūd iti nādhamādharayā (III.8) iti prāptih samhitā-
yām¹² dīrgha iti kṛp. eṣa-... ity atra prāptisampādānārtham .*

following word. The limitation "in case of separation, if followed by a consonant" is for the sake of excluding such cases as *rtadhā-mā'si* (1 3 3 in separated form, *rtadhānā asi*), which would otherwise come under the rule in 8 [among the specifications of which, *dhānā* is included]. The limitation "a long vowel in *samhitā*" is intended to bring *ēsha vo bharaatā rāyā* (1 8 10² et al., *pada*-text, *bharatāh*) under the action of the rules, since thus, and not otherwise, is pertinence given to the word *yāgyā* in rule 11 of this chapter. Undue extension of the prescription to such cases as *tvā vāyavah* (1 1 1) is provided against by the rules that follow [since these specify all the cases in which it is to be applied].

The only difficulty arising in connection with the understanding of this rule, or of the interpretation of it given by the commentator, grows out of the specification *vyāñyanapara*, 'followed by a consonant'. Respecting this, we are explicitly told, near the beginning of the exposition, "the being followed by a consonant is to be understood here of the condition of things in the *samhitā*-text"—that is to say, any long vowel which appears in *samhitā* as a final, with a consonant following it, is to be regarded as falling under the rules of the chapter. This specification, then, makes the rules apply to such cases as *bharatā rāyā* (the example quoted by the commentator the *pada*-reading is *bharatāh rāyā*) and *adhā mā* (quoted under rule 9, *pada*-reading *adhāh mā*), and they have to be specially allowed for and excepted—as is done in rules 9 and 11. It seems very strange, now, to have this implication made, requiring as a consequence that all the words which by euphonic processes come to exhibit in *samhitā* a long final vowel (*ā*) should be taken into consideration but the number of cases actually needing to be guarded against in the rules on account of it is very small. For, in the first place, the question can arise only in regard to the words specially mentioned in the rules, and among these there are not many for which homophonous forms in *āh* or *āi* occur, and of these, again, only a part would occur otherwise than before a vowel, in which situation the hiatus would betray the omission of the former final element. The makers of the treatise, then, appear to have thought it safer to avoid a possible confusion of *adhā* from *adhāh* with *adhā* from *adhāi*, and so on, by making the rules apply in general to both cases, and specially excepting the former. And this is what they have attempted to do and it has cost them only two additional words—*agnyā-jye* in rule 9, and *yāgyāsu* in rule 11—together with an artifice of

tathā sati bharatā yāgyāsu (in 11) *iti yāgyāpadam sārthakanā 'nyathā vyāñyanam asmāt param*¹³ *iti vyāñyanaparāh* *tvā.... ity ādāv etallakṣhanasambhavād*¹⁴ *atvayāptim*¹⁵ *uttara-sūtrāḥ pariharati*

¹ G M ins *padāḍau ca padante ca yo dirgho vyāñyanottaro vādhāge kriyamaṇe hravam samyāth* ² G M *-nam* ⁽³⁾ M om, G *hravānt* ⁴ G om ca ⁵ G M *-āhah* ⁽⁶⁾ W om ⁷ G M *yate* ⁸ G M om ⁹ G M *gaṇād* ¹⁰ W *daḍ* ¹¹ W *nā* ¹² G M ins *yo* ¹³ G M *ia* ¹⁴ G M *eva tāi* ¹⁵ W *atipra*

construction under rule 8, in connection with the word *pañdāh*. Without a complete *index verborum* to the Sanhitā, or a laboriously minute examination of the whole text with reference to this particular point, I cannot tell just how nearly successful their attempt has been, but I have, I believe, discovered at least one case which they have overlooked. At 1424, namely, we read *rakshā mākih* (p. *rakshāh*), and, by rule 8, the *ā* of *rakshā* should be shortened. That the section containing these words was really a part of the text for which the Pṛtiçākhyā was constructed is proved by the fact that two of its peculiarities of reading are provided for in later rules (x15 and x18).

But with the interpretation thus given appears to be quite at variance the phrase containing the illustration *rtadhāmā'si*, where *vibhāge* and *vyañjanaparaṇ* are immediately connected, and made to mean 'followed by a consonant in separated text' (not *rtadhāmā asi*). This I can hardly believe to be a genuine part of the commentary. The second *ā* of *rtadhāmā'si* cannot be said to be either final or initial: it is a combination of both: it does not furnish a case to which the rules of the chapter apply with any propriety, as the *saṃhitā* reading cannot be affected by them. If not some later meddler, then the commentator himself, has suffered himself to be scared by an imaginary difficulty, and has unnecessarily twisted the rule a little awry in order to its removal.

The specification *vibhāge*, 'in case of separation,' applies in the Tāttariya *pada*-text more generally and more strictly than in those of the other Vedas. Where the separation of a compound is suspended on account of its further composition, the restoration of its natural form is suspended also: and we read, for example, *virya-vat*, but *viryāvat-tara*, *viçva-mitra*, but *viçvāmītra-jamadagnī*, *anu-yāya* and *anamu-yāya*, but *prayāya-anūyāya*, and so on—and we shall find illustrations hereafter in connection with other changes than prolongation of vowels. Thus, also, in the full *pada* readings, the word is given first, before *iti*, in its *saṃhitā* form, without change (except euphonic combination with the *iti*), and this part of the reading I shall accordingly usually omit in quoting the *pada*-text, setting down only the separated and restored form which follows *iti*, or the part which corresponds to the entire reading of the Rik and Atharvan *pada*-texts.

देवाशीकासुम्नाश्चर्तावयुनाहृदयाधोक्याशुद्धा ॥ २ ॥

2 Devā, çākā, sumnā, çvā, rtā, vayunā, hrdayā, aghā,

2 ----- *ity eteshu grahaneshv avagraheshv* ¹ *antyasvaro vibhāge* *vyañjanaparo hrasvam āpadyate yathā dev-----*
 çik----- *sumn----- dyāv-----* ² *apy akarādī* (152) *iti vacanād* ³ *idam apy udāharanam* ⁴ *açv----- rt----- vay-----* ²
hrd----- agh----- ukth----- āpo-----

¹ G M om ² B om ³ G M *sutrād* ⁴ G M *-hartavyam*

ukthā, and *śuddhā*, as first members of a compound, shorten their final when separated

This and the following rules, including the seventh, properly form one connected passage, with the specification *ity avagrahaḥ*, 'these, as former members of a compound,' which applies alike to them all, standing at the end

The examples quoted from the *Sanhitā* in illustration of the rule are as follows For *devā devāyate yagamānāya śarma* (III 5 5³ G M omit the last word of the citation), the only case, so far as I have noted, for *devāyant*, we have *devayate* (with short vowel) twice, at 12 12³ and 11 5, 9³ *devāyuvam* occurs 11 5 9⁶ and 14 1 1³, but *devayuh*, III 5 11¹ For *śikā, śikāyate svāhā* (VI 5 11²), the only case For *sumnā, sumnāyanto havāmahe* (15 11⁴), also alone For *śvā, dyāvāprthivyā śvāvut* (1 5 20) *śvā*, however, by rule 152, includes *aśvā*, for which is quoted *aśvāvatīṅ somavatīm* (14 2 6⁴), I have noted farther only III 3 11¹, but feel less than usual confidence in the completeness of my exception For *rtā, rtāyavah purā'nnam akṣan* (11 2 5³ G M omit the last word of the citation) there are more than twenty such cases in the text, for the themes *rtāyu* (e g 14 5 but *rtāyu* once, 11 2 12⁴), *rtāyant* (e g 14 2 9³), *rtāvan* (e g 13 14²) and its feminine *rtāvari* (e g 11 3), *rtāvrdh* (e g 14 5), and *rtāsah* (III 4 7¹ but this word reads in *pada* as in *sanhitā*) For *vayunā, vayunāvāt eka it* (12 13¹ and 14 1 1¹) For *hrdayā, hrdayāvidhaḥ cit* (14 45¹) For *aghā, aghāyavo mā gandharvo viśvāvasur ādadhat* (12 9 G M omit after *gandharvah*) other cases of *aghāyu* are found at III 3 11¹ 14 1 10³, 5 10⁴ 7 3¹, and of *aghāyant*, 11 3 14¹ For *ukthā, ukthāmadānām dhenuh* (11 4 11⁶) the same compound occurs again at III 3 2¹ and 7 6 8⁶, and *ukthāyu* at 14 12, twice For *śuddhā, āpo devīh śuddhāyuvah* (13 8² and VI 3 8⁴)

इन्द्रा वदन्वान्प्रः ॥३॥

3 Also *indrā*, when followed by *vat*, *van* and *vān*

One example is quoted by the commentator for each of the three cases enumerated *indrāvatīm apacitīm ihā'vaha* (7 7 4³ G M omit after *apacitīm*), *indrāvanto marutah* (14 7 14¹), and *indrāvānt svāhā* (11 12), and I have noted no others As counter-examples, he quotes first, to show that not every long *ā* is to be shortened before the three syllables named, *ārṇāvantam prathamah sīda yonim* (III 5 11¹ G M give only the first two words), *asura prayāvān* (III 1 11¹ but B reads, I presume only by an

3 *indre 'ty asminn' avagrahe 'ntyasvaro vad van vān ity evamparo vibhāge hrasvam āpadyate yathā' ind- ind- ind- indre 'ti kim ārn- as praj- evampura iti kim ind-*

¹ G M *etasminn* ² G M *om*

error, *pratāpavān*), and *prajāvatīr anamīvā ayakshmdh* (1.1 1 but omitted in G M), second, to show that *indrā* is not altered except under the circumstances specified, *indrāvarunayor aham* (11 5 12²) This last is a case in which no *vibhāga*, or 'separation,' would be made in any text of the other Vedas, but the Tāittirīya *pada* reads *indrāvarunayor itī 'ndrā-varunayoh*, and the example is therefore to the purpose

चित्रा वपरः ॥ ४ ॥

4 Also *citrā*, when followed by *v*

The illustrative passage cited is *citrāvaso svasti te pāram aśīya* (1 5 5⁴ and 7⁵ G M omit after *te*) As counter-examples, are given *mitrāvarunāv eva* (11 1 7³ et al p *mitrā-varunāv*), and *citrāpārnāmāse dīksheran* (vii 4 8²)—the former to show the necessity of the restriction to *citrā*, the latter, of the restriction to sequence by a *v* I have found no farther instances falling under the rule

प्रस्थेन्द्रियाद्रविणाविश्वदेव्यादीर्धावीर्याविश्वावातावा-
भङ्गुराकर्णिकावृष्ण्यासुगोपकसामाधासत्रावर्षाषुष्यामे-
घाप्रस्वा ॥ ५ ॥

5 Also *prasthā*, *indriyā*, *dravinā*, *viṣvadevyā*, *dīrghā*, *vīryā*, *viṣvā*, *vātā*, *tvā*, *bhaṅgurā*, *karnakā*, *vrshnyā*, *sugopā*, *rksāmā*, *aghā*, *satrā*, *varshā*, *pushpā*, *meghā*, *prā*, *svā*

For each of these words, the commentator cites a single example For *prasthā*, *prasthāvad rathavāhanam* (1v 2 5⁶), the only case For *indriyā*, *indriyāvate purodācam* (11 2 7¹) half a dozen cases of this word occur in the text, and several of *indriyāvin* (e g 1 6 2⁴ 11 1 6³ vi 2 10⁶), the latter word, however, is not separated in the *pada*-text For *dravinā*, *dravināvatuh kurute* (v 3 11²), the only case For *viṣvadevyā*, *viṣvadevyāvate svātrāh* (14 1¹) the word occurs also at 1v 1 6^{1,2} For *dīrghā*, *dīrghādhryo rakshamānāh* (11 1 11⁴), the only case For *vīryā*, *vīryāvantam abhumāti-shāham* (12 7) the same theme is found in other passages, as also its comparative, *vīryāvat-tara* (e g 1 7 6³), and superlative, *vīryāvat-tama* (11 4 2¹), in which the shortening of the *ā* is not authorized by the Prātiśākhya, since, in the division, it does not stand next before the pause and the *pada*-text reads accordingly For *viṣvā*, *viṣvāmitrasya saktam bhavati* (v 2 3^{3,4} G M omit

4 *citrā ity asminn¹ avagrahe 'ntyasvaro vakāraparo² vibhāge hrasvam āpadyate yathā³ cit----- citre 'ti kim mitr----- vapara iti kim citr-----*

¹ G M *etasminn* ² G M *vap* ³ G M *om*

the last word) the same word occurs in other passages (iv 3 2² v 2 3^{3,4}, 10⁵, 4 2²), as also in the compound *viṣvāmitrayamad-agnī* (v 4 11³), where, as the division is *viṣvāmitra-jamadagni*, the *ā* is not shortened, and we have further the themes *viṣvāvasu* (e g 1 1 11¹), *viṣvāvanta* (iii 5 6²), *viṣvārāḍy* (1 3 2¹), and *viṣvāsah* (1 4 17, p *viṣva-sāham*) For *vātā*, *vātāvad varshan* (ii 4 7¹), the only case For *tvā*, *tvāvato naghonah* (ii 2 12⁸, p *tvā-vatah*) the Rik *pada*-text does not shorten the *ā* of this word For *bhaṅ-guā*, *bhettāram bhaṅgurāvatah* (1 5 6⁴ and iv 1 2⁵) For *karna-kā*, *sūrmī karnakāvaty etayā* (1 5 7⁶ and v 4 7³ G M omit the first word, W B the last) For *vrshnīyā*, *vrshnīyāvatas tava* (iii 5 6^{2 3}) For *sugopā*, *sa sugopātamo janah* (iv 2 11², p *sugopa-tamah* G M omit the first word) the Rik *pada* writes *su-gopā-tamah* For *rksāmā*, *rksāmābhyām yaṇushā* (1 2 3³ and iii 1 1⁴) For *aghā*, *aghāḥvād evāi 'nam antar eti bhūtam* (iii 1 7², p *agha-ḥvāt* G M omit the last two words), the Rik and Atharvan *pada*-texts write *agha-ḥvā* the themes *aghāyū* (e g 1 2 9¹) and *aghā-yant* (ii 3 14¹) are also found in the Sanhitā For *satrā*, *satrāḍitam dhanayitam* (iv 1 1³, p *satra-ḍitam*) the word *satrā* occurs repeatedly (e g 1 6 12¹) uncompounded, and maintains its long final in the *pada*-text also For *varshā*, *varshāhvām juhoti* (ii 4 10⁸, p *varsha-hvām*) For *pushpā*, *pushpāvatiḥ supippalāh* (iv 1 4⁴ and v 1 5¹⁰) For *meghā*, *meghāyate svāhā* (vii 5 11¹, p *megha-yate*, in the same division occurs also *meghāyishyate*, which is not divided *meghayanti* is found at iv 4 5¹) For *prā*, *prāvanebhīh sayoshasah* (iv 2 4³, p *prā-vanebhīh*), the Rik *pada*-text writes this word *pravana*, without separation other words beginning with *prā* are *prāsah* (e g 1 3 14⁶, p *prā-sahā*), *prācṛṅga* (ii 1 3^{4 5}), *prāsaca* (vii 5 11¹, not divided in *pada*-text), *prākācu* (1 8 18, also not divided), and *prāvṛta* (iv 6 2² et al, also not divided) And for *svā*, *svādhiyam janayat sūdayac ca* (1 3 14⁶, p *sva dhi-yam*) but this the Rik *pada*-text writes *su-ādhiyam*

लोकश्चेष्टा ॥ ६ ॥

6 Also *ish-tā*, after *loke* and *eva*

The commentator cites the two cases *saṃ amuṣmīn loka ish-tāpārtena* (iii 3 8⁵ twice G M omit the first word), and *sa tv eve 'ish-tāpārte* (1 7 3³, p *ish-ta-pārte*) Then, to show that *ish-tā* after other words remains unchanged, he quotes *pratr jāgrhy enam ish-tāpārte sañ srjethām ayam ca* (iv 7 13⁵, p *ish-tā-pārte* W B

5 ----- ity eteshv avagraheshv antyasvaro vibhāge vyañya-
naparo hrasvam āpadyate * yathā pras----- indī-----
drav----- viṣv----- dīr----- vīr----- viṣv----- vāt-----
'tvā----- bhett----- sūr----- vrsh----- sa----- rks-----
agh----- satr----- varsh----- pushp----- megh-----
prāv----- svā-----

omit before *enam*, G M after *-pūrte*), and the same mode of treatment is followed by the *pada*-text at v 7 7², which is the only other case I have noted. The ground of this difference does not appear. To show, further, that only *ishṭā* shortens its *ā* in the defined position, the passage *sākshād eva prayāpataye* (v 1 2⁵) is given

शक्तोरथीविषीवाशीराज्योषध्याहुतीव्याहृतीस्वाहा-
कृतीह्लादुनीशचीचितीश्रोणीपृष्टीपूत्यभीचर्षणीपर्यधीपा-
रीशत्रूविष्वसूअनूहूनूस्विभू इत्यवग्रहः ॥ ७ ॥

7 Also *çakti*, *rathî*, *tvishî*, *vâçî*, *râtrî*, *oshadhî*, *âhutî*, *vyâhrtî*, *svâhâkrtî*, *hrâdunî*, *çacî*, *cutî*, *cronî*, *prshṭî*, *pûṭî*, *abhî*, *carshanî*, *parî*, *adhî*, *pârî*, *çatrû*, *vishû*, *vasû*, *anû*, *hanû*, *sû*, *vibhû*—all these, as first members of a compound

To the passages cited by the commentator I add, as above, notice of other cases which I have found in the text. For *çakti*, the sole instance is *çaktivanto gabhîrâh* (iv 6 6³). For *rathî*, *rathî-tamâu rathînâm* (iv 7 15³). For *tvishî*, *saspiṅgarâya tvishîmate pathînâm* (iv 5 2¹). W B omit the last word, G M the first. For *vâçî*, *te vâçimanta ishminah* (ii 1 11² and iv 2 11²). G M omit the last word. For *râtrî*, *râtrîbhur asubhnan* (ii 4 1¹) if there are other cases, I have failed to note them. For *oshadhî*, *oshadhîbhyo vehatam âlabheta* (ii 1 5³). G M omit the last word. I have noted half a dozen other cases, but they are not worth reporting. For *âhutî*, *âhutîbhur anânyâgeshu* (ii 6 9⁴). For *vyâhrtî*, *etâbhur vyâhrtîbhuh* (i 6 10² and v 5 5³). For *svâhâkrtî*, *svâhâkrtî-bhyah prshye 'ty âha* (vi 3 9⁵). G M omit the last two words. For *hrâdunî*, *svâhâ hrâdunîbhyah svâhâ* (vii 4 13). G M omit the first word, W B the last. For *çacî*, *viçvâ rūpâ 'bhi cashte çacî-bhuh* (iv 2 5⁴). W B omit before *cashte*. For *cutî*, *cutîbhyâm upâyan* (v 7 5⁷). For *cronî*, *cronîbhyâñ svâhâ* (vii 3 16²). Another case is found at v 7 15. For *prshṭî*, W B give *prshṭîbhur divam* (v 7 17), but G M read *prshṭîbhyah svâhâ* (vii 3 16¹). For *pûṭî*, *pûṭigandhasyâ 'pahatyâ* (ii 2 2⁴). For *abhî*, *abhîvrtô ghrnî-vân cetati tmanâ* (iii 5 11¹). G M omit the last two words. We have also *abhîshah* at ii 3 2⁶ (p *abhî-sahâ*). For *carshanî*, *mitra-sya carshanîâhrtah* (iii 4 11⁵ and iv 1 16³). Another case at i 4 16. For *parî*, *vîravantam parînasam* (ii 2 12⁸, p *parî-nasam* compare rule vii 4). For *adhî*, *adhîvâsam yâ huanyâny asmâi* (iv 6 9²). G M omit the last word. For *pârî*, *pârînahyasye 'çe* (vi 2 1¹, p *pârî-nahyasya* compare rule vii 4). For *çatrû*, *ça-*

6 *loke eva ity evampûrva ishte 'ty asmin' grahane' ntya-svaro vibhâge vyañjanaparo hrasvam âpadyute yathâ sam----*
sa---- *evampûrva iti kim prati----* *ishte 't'kim sâk----*

¹ G M *etasmîn* ² G M *avagrahe*

trūyato hantā (i 6 5³ and iv 2 1²) For *vishā*, *vishūvān vishūvan-tah* (vii 4 3⁴) another case at vii 4 8² For *vasū*, *aramatir vasū-yuh* (iv 3 13⁶) For *anū*, *anūrādā naktshatram* (iv 4 10²), we have it also in the compounds *anūyāga* (e g ii 6 9⁴), *anūbandhya* (e g ii 2 9⁷), *anūkāca* (e g v 4 1⁵), and *anūvry* (v 7 23) In the further compound of the first, *prayājānūyāga* (e g i 7 1¹, p *prayāga-anūyājān*), the shortening is not authorized, since in it there is no division after *anu* Appealing to rule 1 53 as his authority, the commentator adds, as contemplated by the present rule, *ananūyāgam prayānūyam* (vi 1 5³, p *ananu-yāgam*) For *hantā*, *hantā-bhyāñ svāhā* (vii 3 16¹) For *sū*, *sūyavasini manave yaçasye* (i 2 13²) *sūyavasa* occurs more than once (e g i 7 5^{2,3}) For *vibhā*, *vibhādāve* (iii 5 8,9²)

The commentator notes that the specification at the end of this rule defines the whole mass of words thus far enumerated as collectively *avagraha* (i 49), 'first members of compounds'

अवासचस्वानुदामृडावर्धाशिक्षारक्ष्याभवाभजायत्रा-
चरापिबानाधामाधाराधर्षाधावर्ध्याबोधात्रातत्रामुच्चाश्च-
स्यापूषास्वादिष्टावंतराज्ञनिष्ठायुच्चाह ॥ ८ ॥

8 Also *avā*, *sacasvā*, *nudā*, *mrdā*, *vardhā*, *çikshā*, *rakshā*, *adyā*, *bhavā*, *bhajā*, *yatrā*, *carā*, *pibā*, *nā*, *dhāmā*, *dhārayā*, *dharshā*, *ghā*, *vardhayā*, *bodhā*, *atrā*, *tatrā*, *mucā*, *açvasyā*, *prnasvā*, *hi shthā*, *tvam tarā*, *janishvā*, *yukshvā*, *achā*

Henceforth we have to do only with independent words, the category of *avagrahas*, or former members of compounds, having been exhausted by the foregoing rules There is cited in illustration, for *avā*, *avā no devyā krpā* (iv 1 4¹) For *sacasvā*, *sacasvā nah svastaye* (i 5 6²) For *nudā*, *pra nudā nah sapatnān* (iv 3 12¹ thrice, and v 3 5¹) For *mrdā*, W B give *mrdā jaritre* (iv 5 10⁴), but G M read *mrdā no rudra* (iv 5 10²) I have noted no other case For *vardhā*, *vardhā no amavac chavah* (ii 6 11³) For *çik-*

7 ----- *ity eteshv avagraheshv¹ antyasvaro vibhāge vyañja-*
naparo hravvam āpadyate yathā çak-.... rath-.... sa-....
te-.... rā-.... osh-.... āh-.... et-.... svā-.... svā-
hā-.... viç-.... cit-.... gro-.... prsh-.... pāt-....
abh-.... mitr-.... vir-.... adh-.... pār-.... çatr-....
vish-.... ar-.... anū-.... ankārādī ca² (1 53) in vacandā³
anan-.... ity etad⁴ uddāharamam bhavati han-.... sūy-....
vibh-.... ity avagraha ity anena prakāreṇo 'ktih⁵ padasam-
uddāye⁶ vagraho vyñeyah⁷

¹ G M om ² G M om ³ G M *sūtrāt* ⁴ G M ms *apy* ⁵ G M *'ktah* •
⁶ G M *-muccayah* ⁷ B *viçeshah*

śhā, śikshā no asman puruhāta yāmam (vii 5 7⁴ W B omit the last two words) it is found again at iv 6 2⁵ For *rakshā, rakshā ca no adhi ca deva brāhi* (iv 5 10³ and vii 5 24, G M omit the last two words) the form occurs also at ii 3 14¹ I have pointed out in the note to the first rule of the chapter that a passage (i 4 24) in which *rakshā* appears as euphonic alteration of *rakshāh* before a sonant consonant ought to be somehow excepted here For *adyā, adyā devān jushtatamah* (iv 6 7⁵) also at ii 1 11⁶ iii 4 11² iv 6 2⁶ For *bhavā, bhavā pāyur viço asyā adabdhah* (i 2 14¹ G M omit the last two words) other cases are not infrequent, see i 1 14⁴, 4 32 ii 2 5³, 4 10¹ iv 1 7², 2 5¹, 7⁴, 4 4⁷, and likewise ii 6 12¹, where *bhavā*, standing at the end of the first division of the *anuvāka*, is situated *vibhāge*, and loses its *ā* even in the *samhitā*-text For *bhayā, ā gomati vraye bhayā tvam nah* (i 6 12¹ W B begin at *vraye*) another case at iii 3 9² For *yatrā, yatrā naro marutah* (iii 1 11⁸) other cases at iv 4 4¹, 6 6⁴, 7² For *carā, pra carā soma dhuryān* (i 2 10¹) For *pibā, pibā somam indra mandatu* (ii 4 14³ G M omit the last word) another case at i 4 19 For *nā, ripavo nā ha debhuh* (i 2 14⁵ 6) in connection with this word, the commentator runs off into a lengthy discussion, which I defer to the end of the note For *dhāmā, dhāmā ha yat te agara* (iii 1 11⁶) we have *dhāma*, plural, in *samhitā* also, at iv 6 5⁵, 7 13⁴ For *dhārayā, brhaspate dhārayā vasūni* (i 3 7¹ and vi 3 6¹) other cases at iv 1 5⁴, 7² For *dharshā, W B have dharshā mānushān adbhayah* (i 3 8¹), but G M, *dharshā mānushān iti ni yunakti* (vi 3 6³) For *ghā, uta vā ghā syāāt* (i 1 14¹) there is another case, if my manuscript reads correctly, at iii 4 11⁶ For *vardhayā, tam agne vardhayā tvam* (iv 6 3¹) other cases are at i 5 5² iv 2 4⁴, 7 13⁵ For *bodhā, bodhā no asya vacaso yavishtha* (iv 2 3⁴ G M omit the last two words) For *atrā, atrā te rūpam* (iv 6 7³) other cases are at iv 6 7², 8² For *tatrā, tatrā ratham upa śagmam* (iv 6 6³) For *muñcā, pra muñcā svastaye* (iii 2 8³) again at iv 7 15⁷ For *agvasyā, ekas tvash-tur agvasyā vīçastā* (iv 6 9³) For *prnasvā, sapta yonir ā prnasvā ghrtena* (i 5 3³ and iv 6 5⁵) For *sthā* after *hi, āpo hi sthā mayobhuvah* (iv 1 5¹ v 6 1⁴ vii 4 19⁴), and, as counter-example, to show that the correction takes place only after *hi, pratishthā vā ekaviñśah* (v 2 3⁶ et al) For *tarā* after *tvam, agne tvam tarā mrāhah* (iv 1 9³), with the counter-example *antaratarā taptavratō bhavati* (vi 2 2⁷ G M omit the last word) For *janishvā, jan-*

8 ----- ¹ eteshv anavagraheshv antyasvaro vibhāge vyañjana-
 paro hrasvam āpadyate yathā avā---- sac---- pra----
 mr---- var---- śiksh---- rak---- adyā---- bhav-
 ---- ā go---- yat---- pra---- pibā---- rip---- api
 vikrtam (151) apy akārādī (152) iti dvābhyām² vacanā-
 bhyām prā---- ity atra hrasvādeṣah kim na syāt mār 'vam
 api vikrtam (151) iti vacanam kanthoktapadāviśhayam³ nā tv
 akārādīpadāviśhayam⁴. prānā⁵ ity asyā 'py akārādītvān nā

shvā hi janyo agne (iv 1 3⁴ and v 1 4⁵ G M omit *agne*) For *yukshvā*, *yukshvā hi devahūtamān* (ii.6 11¹ et al) other cases at iv 2 9⁵ v 5 3^{1,2} For *achā*, *achā nakshā dyumattamah* (i 5 6³ and iv 4 4⁸) other cases at i 7 10² ii 2 12³, 6 11¹ iv 2 4² twice, 4 4² (if my MS is correct, the Rik reads *acha*), 5 1², 6 7⁵ but the compound *achāvāka* (vii.1 5⁵) is left undivided and unchanged

The occasion of the commentator's delay and discussion over the word *nā* is given by the fact that the *pada*-text of the Tāttirīya Sanhitā (unlike that of the Rik and Atharvan see note to Ath Pr iv 39) divides the word *prānā* thus *pra-anā*. Hence, when we read in the Sanhitā, as in the passage which he quotes, *prānā vā aṅṣavah* (vi 4 4⁴ W B read simply *prānā vā*, which occurs in various other places, e g v 3 8²), he fears that, having this division in mind, we shall be misled into believing that the specification *nā* of the present rule applies to *prānā*, because we are taught in the first chapter (i 51,52) that a word cited in any rule comes equally under that rule when phonetically altered, or preceded by *a*. He sets aside this difficulty, however, by the arbitrary *dictum* that it is not permitted to vary the same word in both ways at once—that we may accept the altered form only of a vocable which is actually quoted entire, not of one made by the prefixion of an *a* to one so quoted—hence, he infers, the present rule does not apply to [the *anā* of] *prānā*, as it begins with *a*. But a further objection is interposed in that case, why does it not apply to the part *anā* of the compound, in which is no altered *n*? He replies, because of the absence of a long vowel in *samhitā*, in a word wearing this form—or, as would seem a better statement, because of the absence of any such word in *samhitā* as *anā* (for *anā*) with a long vowel as its final. The second objection, in fact, is a wholly futile one, scarcely worth the trouble of bringing up and setting aside. The original difficulty is one growing out of the extension of the leading rule in the chapter to cases of final *ā* in *samhitā* where a *visarjanīya* has been lost after it (see note to rule 1). The answer has a somewhat quibbling aspect, but the rule of interpretation which it involves is in accordance with that adopted in one or two analogous cases elsewhere

अध्याग्न्याये ॥ १ ॥

9 Also *adhā*, in *agni* and *yājyā* passages

'yam vidhuh tarhi vikrtatvādbhāvād' anā ity asye' 'nygāñṣasya'
kim na syād ayam vidhuh evamrūpasya samhitādyām dīrghābhā-
vāt dhā----- brh----- dhar----- uta----- tam----- bo-
dhā----- atrā----- tat----- pra----- ek----- sap-----
āpo----- hā 'ti kim pra----- agne----- tvam ite kim
ant----- jan----- yuk----- achā-----

¹ G M ins *ity* ² G M om ³ W *krp.*, B om *pada* ⁴ B om *pada* ⁵ W ins *vā* ⁶ G M *vākrtyasādhā* ⁷ B G M om ⁸ B G M *-yāḥ*

The commentator's first care is to define what parts of the Sanhitā are styled *agni* and *yājyā*. The former name, he says, designates those *mantras* which celebrate Agni—namely, the fourth *kānda* by the latter are intended the concluding *anuvākas*, or sections, of every *pragṇa*, or chapter, from the beginning of the Sanhitā to the third *pragṇa* of the fourth *kānda*, inclusive, and, besides, the eleventh *anuvāka* of *pragṇa* six, *kānda* two (i e 11 14, 2 14, 3 14, 4 46, 5 11, 6 12, 7 13, 8 22 11 11, 2 12, 3 14, 4 14, 5 12, 6 11, 12 11 11, 2 11, 3 11, 4 11, 5 11 11 11, 2 11, 3 13—in all, twenty-three *anuvākas*). The name *agni* does not occur again the *yājyās* are the subject of further prescription below, in rules 11 11, 11 20, 11 3. The compound *agniyājyā* (neuter singular) is justified by a simple reference to Pāṇini's rule (11 2 29) defining a copulative compound.

The passages cited in illustration of the rule are *adhā hy agne kratoh* (11 4 4⁷), *adhā ca nah śarma yacha dvibarhāh* (11 5 10³ G M omit the last word), *adhā te sumnam imahe* (11 6 11⁴), and *adhā yathā nah pitarah* (11 6 12⁴ W B omit the last word). I have noted no other cases. As counter example, to show the necessity of the restriction imposed in the rule, is quoted *adhā me 'ti tad vishnave 'ti prāyachat* (11 4 12⁴ W B omit *prāyachat*), where *adhā* stands for *adhāh* see, for the bearing of the exception, the note upon the introductory rule of the chapter.

कुत्रादक्षिणेनास्वेनाहन्तनाजगामारुहेमाविद्वर्ध्यामाच-
कृमाक्षामास्त्रीमाभरेमावर्षयथेरयथारियापाथायासिञ्चथा-
जनयथाजयतोक्षतावतायाताशृणुताकृणुताबिभृता ॥ १० ॥

10 Also *kutrā*, *dakshinenā*, *svenā*, *hantanā*, *jagāmā*, *ru hemā*, *vidmā*, *rdhyāmā*, *cakrmā*, *kshāmā*, *starimā*, *bharemā*, *varshayathā*, *irayathā*, *arīthā*, *pāthā*, *athā*, *svīcathā*, *janayathā*, *jayatā*, *ukshatā*, *avatā*, *yātā*, *ṣṇutā*, *krnutā*, *bibhrtā*.

The commentator's illustrative passages are for *kutrā*, *kutrā cid yasya samrtāu* (11 1 11³ G M omit the last word). For *dak-*

9 *agnis ca yājyā cā 'gniyājyam¹ tasman² cā 'rthe dvandva iti³ samāsah agnir ity agniprahāṣakamantrā⁴ lakshyante ca turtihakānda ity arthah. ubhā vām indragñi⁵ (11 14¹) prābhṛty agnir vtrāni⁶ (11 3 13¹) paryantāh praṇottamānuvākā yājyāsamyā bhavanti yukshvā 'hi⁷ (11 6 11¹) ity anuvākaḥ ca 'atra vishaye⁸ 'dhe 'ty asmin⁹ grahane 'ntyasvaro vbbhāge¹⁰ vyañjanaparo hrasvam āpadyate yathā adhā hy---- adhā ca---- adhā te---- adhā y---- agniyājyā iti kim adhā m----*

¹ G M *jye* ² G M *-inṣ* ³ G M om ⁴ B *-ṣaman-* ⁵ G M om ⁶ G M *etasmān* ⁷ G M om

śhinend, dakshinend vasāni patih sindhānām asī (III 4 11⁴ G M omit after *vasāni*) For *svenā, svenā hi vrtrañ gavasā jaghantha* (VII 4 15 B omits the last word, G M the last two) For *hantand, tapasā hantand tam* (IV 3 13⁴) For *jagāmd, ā jagāmd parasyāh* (I 6 12⁵) For *ruhemā, asravanti ā ruhemā svastaye* (I 5 11⁵) For *vidmā, vidmā te agne nedhā trayāni vidmā te* (IV 2 2¹ G M stop at *agne*, thus instancing only one of the two cases, there are two more in the same verse) also at I 7 13³ II 6 11⁴ For *rdhyāmā, rdhyāmā ta ohāh* (IV 4 4⁷) For *cakrmā, cakrmā kac canā "gah* (IV 7 15⁶) other cases at I 8 3 II 6 12² IV 1 11¹, 6 8³ For *kshāmā, kshāmā rerihad vīrudhak* (I 3 14² IV 2 1², 2² G M omit the last word) other cases at II 6 12⁴ IV 7 12³ For *starimā, sushtarimā yushānā* (V 1 11²) here the application of rule 151 becomes necessary For *bharemd, añho-muce pra bharemd manishām* (I 6 12³ G M omit the last word) For *varshayathā, yāyam vrshtim varshayathā purishinah* (II 4 8² W B omit the first word) For *irayathā, ud irayathā marutah* (II 4 8²) For *ārthā, yoner udārithā yage tam* (IV 6 5⁴) For *pāthā, kshaye pāthā divo vimahasah* (IV 2 11²) For *athā, athā somasya prayati yuvabhyām* (I 1 14¹ G M omit the last word) other cases are numerous, namely I 1 13¹ twice, 5 5², 11³, 6 4² twice, 7 13⁴ II 3 14³, 6 12² III 1 11², 4 11⁶ IV 2 1⁴, 4⁴, 5², 6 1², 6 3⁴ twice, 7 13⁵, and, as I doubt not, at the end of III 2 11², where, however, the present *samhitā*-text reads *atha*, because the word stands *vibhāge* For *siñcathā, yatrā naro marutah siñcathā madhu* (III 1 11³) For *janayathā, āpo janayathā ca nah* (IV 1 5¹ V 6 1⁴ VII 4 19⁴) For *jayatā, upa pre 'ta jayatā nara sthirdh* (IV 6 4⁴ G M omit the last word) For *ukshatā, ā ghrtam ukshatā madhuvarnam* (IV 3 13³) For *avatā, asmān u devā avatā haveshu* (IV 6 4⁴) another case at IV 2 6³ For *yātā, devā rathāur yātā hranyayārāh* (IV 7 12¹ G M omit the first word) For *grnutā, marutah grnutā havam* (IV 2 11²) For *krnutā, samvatsarāya krnutā brhan namah* (V 7 2⁴) Finally, for *bībhrtā, mātē 'va putram bībhrtā sv enam* (IV 2 3² W B. begin at *putram*)

भरता याजयासु ॥ ११ ॥

11 Also *bharatā*, in *yājyā*-passages

• 10 ----- *ity¹ eteshv anavagraheshv² antyasvaro vibhāge*
vyañjanaparo hrasvam āparyate yathā kutrā---- *da-*
ksh---- *svenā*---- *tap*---- *āj*---- *asr*---- *vidmā*----
rdhy---- *cakr*---- *kshā*---- *susht*---- *añh*---- *yā-*
yam---- *ud*---- *yoner*---- *kshaye*---- *athā*---- *ya-*
trā---- *āpo*---- *upa*---- *ā*---- *asmān*---- *devā*----
mar---- *sam*---- *mā*----

¹ G M om ² W *avag*, G M om

Which are the sections called *yāgyā* has been pointed out above, under rule 9

The cited passages are *bharatā vasuvittamam* (III 5 11⁴), *bharatā jātavedasam* (III 5 11¹), and *pūrvyam vaco 'gnaye bharatā brhat* (III 2 11¹ G M omit the first two words), which are all that the text contains. As counter-example, to show the necessity of restricting the change to *yāgyā* passages, is quoted *esha vo bharatā rāyā* (I 8 10², 12²), where *bharatā* stands for *bharatāh*. If the text contained a *bharatā* as instrumental of the participle *bharant*, it would come more properly under the action of the rule, and would have better right to be specifically excluded, but I have not found such a form anywhere. Respecting *bharatā* as standing in *samhita* for *bharatāh*, see what is said in the note to the first rule of this chapter

अत्ताभवतानदतातरतातपतानुहुतावोचतामुच्चताचू-
ताधुष्याजनयावर्तयासादयापारयादीयाहुराभरापाससादा-
सृजातिष्ठयेना ॥ १२ ॥

12 Also *attā*, *bhavatā*, *anadatā*, *taratā*, *tapatā*, *juhutā*, *vo-catā*, *amuñcatā*, *crtā*, *ghushyā*, *janayā*, *varṭayā*, *sādayā*, *pārayā*, *ḍīyā*, *harā*, *bharā*, *apā*, *sasādā*, *srjā*, *tshthā*, and *yenā*

The cited passages are for *attā*, *attā havīṣṣi* (II 6 12²) For *bhavatā*, *ādityāso bhavatā mṛdayantah* (I 4 22 and II 1 11⁴) For *anadatā*, *samprayatīr ahāv anadatā hate* (V 6 1² W B omit the first word) For *taratā*, *suvo ruhānās taratā rayāṇsi* (III 5 4² G M omit the first word) For *tapatā*, *gharmam na sāmam tapatā svvrktibhah* (I 6 12² W B O [O begins in the comment to this rule] omit before *tapatā*) For *juhutā*, *pitre juhutā viśvakarmane* (IV 6 2⁶) For *vocatā*, *viśve devāso adhi vocatā me* (IV 7 14² G M omit to *adhi*) For *amuñcatā*, *padr shulām amuñcatā yajatrāh* (IV 7 15⁷) For *crtā*, *ayasmayam vi crtā bandham etam* (IV 2 5³) For *ghushyā*, *parushparur anu ghushyā viśasta* (IV 6 9³) For *janayā*, *manur bhava janayā dāvyam janam* (III 4 2², 3⁷) For *varṭayā*, *tābhar ā varṭayā punah* (III 3 10¹) For *sādayā*, *sādayā yajñān sukrtasya yondu* (III 5 11² and IV 1 3³) For *pārayā*, *agne tvam pārayā navyo asmān* (I 1 14⁴ all but W omit the last word) For *ḍīyā*, *brhaspate pari ḍīyā rathena* (IV 6 4¹, 2 the text reads *ḍīya*, as the word stands before the division between the first and second fifty of the section) another case is III 1 11⁶ For *harā*, *nihāram in nṛ me harā nihāram*

11 *bharatā ity asmin¹ grahane² 'ntyasvaro yāgyāvishaye³*
vibhāge vyañjanaparo hravam āpadyate yathā bhar----
bhar----- pār----- yāgyāsv iti kim esha----

¹ G M *etasmīn* ² B *avagraheshu* ³ G M *yāgyayām*, and put before the preceding word

(184¹) For *bharā*, *mā* no *mardhīr ā bharā dadhī tan nah pra dāgushe* (1713³ O omits after *bharā*, B G M after *dadhī*) there is no other case, *bharā* at 1814³ in the Calcutta edition being an erratum For *apā*, *duro na vāyaṇ grutyā apā vrdhī* (11212⁶ W B omit the first two words) For *sasāda*, *agnir hotā na sha-sāda yajyān* (1814¹ and 1413⁴ G M omit the first word) there is another case at 1462¹, requiring, like the others, the application of rule 151 For *srjā*, *srjā vrshtim divah* (1148², 10³) there are other cases at 1148² 1155², 10¹ 1418³ For *tishthā*, *tishthā devo na savitā* (1414²) other cases at 1114¹ 1214¹, and perhaps also at 1412³, where the word ends a division of the *anuvāka* For *yenā*, *yenā sahasram vahasi* (14713⁴ and 1777³)

उश्मसीक्रयोक्थीश्रुधीयोदो ॥ १३ ॥

13 Also *uṣmasī*, *kraṣī*, *krdhī*, *crudhī*, and *yadī*

The quoted examples for these words, being the only ones which the text contains, are as follows For *uṣmasī*, *te te dhāmāny uṣmasī gumadhye* (1861² W B O omit the first three words), here, as *uṣmasī* stands at the end of a division, or *vibhāge*, its *i* is short in the accepted text For *kraṣī*, *rudra yat te kraṣī param nāma* (1814²) For *krdhī*, *krdhī sv asmān aditeh* (14715⁷ W B O omit the last word) For *crudhī*, *imam me varuna gadhī havam* (11111⁶) For *yadī*, *yadī bhūmim janayan* (1462⁴)

सूतूनमिथूननूज ॥ १४ ॥

14 Also *sū*, *tū*, *nū*, *muthū*, *makhshū*, and *ū*

The cited passages are as follows for *sū*, *mo shū na indra* (183) For *tū*, *ā tū na upa gantana* (15114⁵) there are two other cases, 1713³ 11212⁷, both after *ā* For *nū*, *etācasya nū rane* (14612²) For *muthū*, *gātrāny asinā muthū kah* (1469⁴ G M omit the first word) For *makhshū*, *makhshū devavato rathah* (1822³) For *ū*, a part of the manuscripts give two examples,

12 ----- *eteshv anavagraheshv*¹ *antyasvaro*² *vibhāge vyañ-janaparo hrasvam āpadyate yathā attā*---- *ād*---- *sampr*---- *suvo*---- *ghar*---- *pitre*---- *viṣve*---- *padī* -- *ayas*---- *par*---- *man*---- *tābh*---- *sād*---- *agne*---- *brh*---- *nih*---- *mā*---- *duro*---- *agnir*---- *srjā*---- *tish*---- *yenā*----

¹ W *av*-, G M *gvaṇaneshu* ² O begins here

13 ----- *ityi*¹ *eteshv*² *anavagraheshv*³ *antyasvaro vibhāge vyañjanaparo hrasvam āpadyate yathā te*---- *rudra*---- *krdhī*---- *imam*---- *yadī*----

¹ G M om ² G M *eshv* ³ W *av*-, G M om

asmābhar ū nu praticakshyā 'bhūt (14 33 wanting in G M), and *ūrdhva ū shu na utaye* (1v 1 4² W B O omit the first word, G M the last) other cases are found at 15 11⁵ 11 5 12² 11 5 10¹ 1v 1 10³, 6 5⁶ 1v 1 5³ 1v 1 18², 6 17²

व्युत्पूर्व आननुदात्तो ञ्नुष्मवत्यनुष्मवति ॥ १५ ॥

15 Also *ān*, when unaccented, and preceded by *vi* or *ut*, in a word containing no spirant

This rule applies simply to the compounds *vyāna* and *udāna*, in which the long *ā* of the radical syllable is treated by the *pada*-text as the effect of an irregular prolongation. The words are instanced by the commentator in their full *pada*-form, *vyāndye 'ti vi-anāya* (11 5 8 et al), and *udāndye 'ty ut anāya* (1v 2 9¹ et al). In the same manner, *prānāya* and *apānāya* are divided into *pra-anāya* and *apa-anāya*. As regards the treatment of this group of compounds, the different *pada*-texts are somewhat inconsistent and somewhat conflicting. The Atharvan *pada* (see Ath Pr 1v 39) divides *vi-āna* and *saṁ-āna*, without correction of the radical *ā*, but leaves *prāna* and *apāna* undivided. The Rik *pada* does not divide *prāna*. I do not know that any of the others are Rik words. The White Yajus, again (Vāj Pr v 33, 36), divides *apa-āna* and *saṁ-āna*, but not *prāna*. The consistency of the Tāttiriya *cākhinaḥ* is to be commended, less, perhaps, their assumption that the *ā* of *āna* is a mere Vedic irregularity, requiring restoration to a correcter form. They also, it may be remarked, divide *prānatha* (1v 1 4¹) into *pra-anatha*.

The commentator goes on to cite counter-examples, proving the necessity of the restrictions imposed by the rule. To show that *ān* is to be shortened only after *vi* and *ut*, he gives *yad āncus tene 'yam* (1v 3 1³ W B O omit the last word), and *paryānīyā havanīyasya* (1v 1 6⁶). To show that only *ān*, not *ā* followed by any other consonant, is shortened, he quotes *yad rukmam vyāghārayati* (v 2 7⁵), and *udādāya prthivīm jīradānuh* (1v 1 9³ G M omit the last word). To show that the *ān* must not be accented, he gives *viśvākarmā vyānat* (1v 2 10⁴), and *nēshtah pātnīm uddānaya* (1v 5 8⁶). Finally, to show that the presence of a spirant in the word prevents the correction, we have *pathā madhor dhārā vyānaguh* (v 7 7³ all but W omit the first word), and *ud ānashur mahīr uti* (v 6 1³).

The question is now in point, how complete is this rehearsal of the cases of prolonged vowels occurring in the Saṁhitā, or, how closely does the *pada*-text which it assumes correspond with that

14 ----- *ity¹ eteshv² anavagraheshv³ antyasvaro vibhāge
vyañganaparo hrasvam āpadyate yathā. mo----- ā-----
eta----- gā----- mak----- asm----- ūrdhva-----*

¹ G M om ² G M *eshv* ³ W *av-*, G M om

found in the existing *pada*-manuscripts? As regards the latter point, I am unable to speak with certainty, of course, without the possession of a *pada*-manuscript, and its careful examination throughout, but so much as this I can say—that, having referred a liberal selection of the most questionable cases to Dr Haug at Munich, for verification in his *pada*-texts, no instance of a discordance between these and the Prāṭicākhya has come to light. Among the cases referred were several in regard to which I was beforehand very confident that I had caught the authors of the Prāṭicākhya in fault. Thus *yojā*, in the refrain *yojā nv indra te harī* (1 8 5^{1,2}), which is shortened to *yoja* in the *pada*-texts both of the Rik (by Rik Pr vii 7) and the White Yajus (by Vāj Pr iii 106), remains *yojā* in that of our Sanhitā. Again, *eva* occurs six times in our text with its final lengthened (viz at 1 8 22² ii 1 11³ iv 2 9², 3 13³, 7 15⁷ v 2 8³), as it does also not infrequently in the other Vedic texts (as noticed and provided for in their Prāṭicākhyas see Rik Pr vii 12, 19, viii 20 Vāj Pr iii 123 Ath Pr iii 16, note, I 1 c) but the Tāttirīya *pada* reads in each case *evā*. Once more, in the passage *tava dharmā yuyopama* (Rig-Veda vii 89 5, Ath Veda vi 51 3, Tātt Sanh iii 4 11⁶), the *pada*-texts of the Rik and Atharvan read *dharmā* (I do not find that the case is noted in the Rik Pr, in the Ath Pr it would fall under the comprehensive rule iii.16), while that of our Sanhitā has *dharmā*, like the *samhitā*-reading.

I will add, as received from the same quarter, a few words respecting which a question might naturally arise as to how they were treated in the *pada*-text. Separated, without correction of the long vowel at the end of their first member, are *uttarā-vat* (v 4 8⁵), *sahasā-van* (1 6 12⁶), *malmatā-bhavant* (1 4 34), *vrshā-kapi* (1 7 13²), such copulative compounds as *indrā-varunayoh* (ii 5 12²) and *agnā-vishnū* (ii 1 12), and *ūrṇā-mradas* (1 1 11¹ while, nevertheless, we have *ūrṇa-mradas* at 1 2 2², the *pada*-reading agreeing in both cases with that of the *samhitā* where the Calcutta edition gets its authority for reading *ūrṇāmmradas* and *ūrṇāmmradas* is more than I can imagine)

15 vī 'ty evampūrva utpūrvo vā 'n ity esha¹ svaro 'nudātto 'nūshnavaty² ūshmarahite pade vartamāno vyañjanaparah padādāu vartamānatvāt pūrvapadena³ vibhāge sati hrasvam āpadyate yathā vyānāye 'ti vi-anāya udānāye 'ty ut-anāya evampūrva iti kim yad.... pary.... nakārah kimarthah⁴ yad.... udā.... anudātta iti kim vi-ṣv.... nesh.... anūshnavatī 'ti kim pathā.... ud....

iti vibhāshyaratne prāṭicākhyavvarane
trītyo 'dhyāyah⁴

¹ G M ins ākara ² W ūshm- ³ G M -de ⁴ G M add grīhshndāya na mah

Not separated, and therefore, of course, without correction of the vowel, are such words as *rtāśhāt* (ii 4 7¹) and *turāśhāt* (i 7 13⁴), also *tvashṭimant* (i 2 5²), *anyādr̥c* (i 8 13²), *ubhayādat* (ii 2 6³), *arāṭiyant* (i 6 1¹) and *arāṭivan* (vii 4 15), *atikāṣa* (i 2 2²) and *prākāṣa* (i 8 18), *avāṣr̥ga* (ii 1 8⁵) and *prāṣr̥ga* (ii 1 3¹ as I doubt not my information is deficient for this word), *upānah* (v 4 4⁴), *nīvāra* (iv 7 4²) and *nīhāra* (iv 6 2²), and *purūravah* (i 3 7¹)

There is not, as in the other Vedic texts, any restoration of a theoretically correct short vowel which is not strictly a final or initial thus we read in *pada*-text, for example, *vāvr̥dhe* (i 4 20), *sāsa-hat* (i 3 14⁷), and *ushāsam* (iv 4 4²)

Many of these items constitute striking peculiarities of the Tāṭtriya *pada*, and its careful study and comparison with the other works of its class would undoubtedly bring to light much that is curious

CHAPTER IV

CONTENTS 1-4, introductory, 5-54, rehearsal of cases of *pragrahas*, or uncombable final vowels.

अथ प्रग्रहः ॥ १ ॥

1 Now the *pragrahas*

A simple heading to the chapter, and explained as such by the commentator The same subject is treated by the other Prāticākhyas, at Rik Pr 118-19, Vāj P1 192-98, Ath Pr 173-82 It occupies here a great deal more space, because the Tāṭ Pr avoids on principle the mention of grammatical categories in its rules, and is at infinite pains to catalogue, word by word, what the other treatises dispose of summarily, by classes A rule in a later chapter (x 24) teaches that all the vowels here rehearsed and defined as *pragraha* are exempt from euphonic combination The term *pragraha* is peculiar to this treatise, the rest using instead *pragrhya*

नावग्रहः ॥ २ ॥

2 No former member of a compound is *pragraha*

As the former member of a separable compound (*avagraha* 149) is regarded and treated as an independent *pada*, the rules declaring certain final vowels *pragraha* would apply to the finals

1 *athe 'ty ayam adhikārah. pragrahā ucyanta ity 'etaḍ' adhikṛtam vedatavyam ita' uttaram yad vakshyāmah*

(1) W om (2) G M om

of such members, but for this prescription to the contrary. The commentator cites rules 5, 6, 36, 37, 49 of the chapter as needing the restriction of their application here made, and quotes from the Sanhitā in illustration *tanūnapād asurāḥ* (1v 18¹ the *tanū* of *tanū-napāt* would otherwise be *pragraha* by rule 5), *agoargham yagamānam* (vi 1 10¹ *ago-argham* would fall else under rule 6), *agnīshomāu mā* (ii 5 2² it is implied that the *pada*-text would write *agnī-somāu*, bringing the word within the sphere of rule 36 such compounds are not divisible in the other Vedic texts), and *dvedve puronuvākye kuryāt* (ii 2 9² the *pada* writes *dve-dve*, so that both members would be declared alike *pragraha* by rule 49). The present precept is therefore declared to be one making exceptions in advance to the rules specified

अन्तः ॥ ३ ॥

3 Only a final is *pragraha*

Or, as the commentator paraphrases, the end of a word is entitled to the designation *pragraha*. He cites, as example, the phrase *devate samrddhyā* (ii 1 9³). The necessity of the rule, he explains, arises out of the fact that the following rules, in part—for example, rules 5, 6, 33—describe certain letters or syllables as *pragraha* without farther limitation, and it is desirable to specify that they bear that character only when final. This in answer to the criticizing inquiry “whether a letter not final can also be *pragraha*?”—that is, as I understand it, whether this predicate is not in the nature of things restricted to finals? But now a yet more troublesome objection is raised. The limitation to finals, urges the interpellator, is otherwise assured, for the word *api* of the next rule, in the sequel of this one, brings into action the principle “continued implication is of that which is last” (i 58). The objection is wholly futile and inept, both as implying that false interpretation of the rule appealed to to which attention was directed in the note upon it, and as attributing to *api* a mysterious force to which it can lay no claim whatever. Instead, however, of showing the

2. *avagrahaḥ pragraho na bhavati ūkārah* (iv 5) *okāro 'sāñhito 'kārayaṇjanaparāḥ* (iv 6) *gnī* (iv 36) *na hīparāḥ* (iv 37) *dve* (iv 49) *iti vakshyate* ¹ *etaḍ* ² *uddiṣya puras-tādapavādo 'nena vidhiyate yathā* ³ *tan-* ⁴ *ago-* ⁵ *agn-* ⁶ *dve-* ⁷ *avagraha* ⁸ *iti jātyapekshāyām ekavacanam*

¹ W -², B O om ³ G M *taḍ* ⁴ G M om ⁵ G M *nā* ⁶ v

3 *padasyā 'ntah pragrahasamyño bhavati yathā dev-* ¹ *atra* ² *ha* ³ *kim apadānto 'pi pragrahaḥ syāt atro 'cyate ūkārah* (iv 5) *ity avigeshena vakshyati* *okāro 'sāñhito 'kārayaṇjanaparāḥ* (iv 6) *iti cī yatpraparāḥ* (iv 33) *iti ca apadāntasyo 'kārasyaṁ 'kārasya cīcābdasya vā pragrahatvam* ⁴ *mā bhūd* ⁵ *iti*

objector to the dooi, the commentator proceeds elaborately to confute him. "We reply, not so specification of finality is appropriate where there is a congeries of several letters, here, on the other hand, there is indication of a single letter. If the matter in question were the euphonic alteration or elision of *u* and the other letters treated of, a final would be designated in virtue of the principle quoted but here it is a simple case of application of the term *pragraha*, not of an affected nor an affecting letter hence continued implication has no force"

इतिपरो ऽपि ॥४॥

4 It is followed by *iti*

This is the interpretation of the commentator, who declares that the "also" (*api*) brings in by implication, from the first rule of the preceding chapter, the specification *viḥhāge*, 'in case of separation,' or in the *padā* or other artificially divided texts. As example, he cites *ubhe iti* (1 4 22 et al. G M add *devate iti*, 11 1 9³ et al.)

If such be its real meaning, the rule is a very anomalous one, as giving a single direct prescription respecting the mode of construction of the secondary texts. These are elsewhere only referred to or implied, in a more indirect manner. I should therefore prefer to translate 'even when followed by *iti*'—that is to say, a word here defined as *pragraha* in the ordinary text has that character also in the other texts before *iti*, not being combined with the latter

उकारः ॥५॥

5 A long *u* is *pragraha*

nanu siddham evā 'tat' etatsūtraṣeshabhūta¹ uttarasūtre² 'piṣa-
bdenā 'nvādeṣo 'ntyasya (1 58) eva kāryanirvādhāt³ ne 'ti
brūmah anekavarṇasamudāye hy antyavram⁴ upapannam
ayam punar ekavarṇanirvādeṣah ūkārāḥ (iv 5) ity ādivarṇasya
yāu vikāralopāu tayo⁵ ' anvādeṣo 'ntyasya (1 58) ity anenā
"ntyah pragraha ity uktam⁶ pragrahasanyñāmātram⁷ na tu⁸
namuttam namuttī vā tasmād anvādeṣo na prasaratī

¹ G M *grahanam* ² B O *ceshe*, G M *bhūt* ³ G M *ottarasya su-* ⁴ G M *vāhakr* ⁵ B O *anta-* ⁶ G M *ins eva* ⁷ G M *'ntyapratyaya uktah* ⁸ G M *ha iti sam-* ⁹ B O *om*

4 *apiṣabdhah sñhāvalokanena 'thā 'dāv uttare viḥhāge*
(11 1) ity atra viḥhāgapadam¹ anvādeṣati so 'yam pragraho
viḥhāga itiparo bhavati yathā² ubhe iti itṛṣabdhah paro
yasmād asāv itiparah

¹ G M *gam* ² G M *ins devate it*

The commentator adds the limitation that, "if long in *pada*-text," the final *ā* is universally *pragraha*, i.e. referring, in justification, to the cases treated of above, in rule iii 14, of an *u* irregularly lengthened in *samhita*. His examples are *hanū vā ete yagnasya* (vi 2 11³ W B O omit the last word), *vāsantikāv rtā gukrag ca* (iv 4 11¹ W B O omit after *rtā*), and *harnasya bāhū upastutam janma tat te arvan* (iv 2 8¹ G M omit the last four words, the others, the first word)

ओकारो ऽसाक्षितो ऽकारव्यञ्जनपरः ॥ ६ ॥

6 Also an *o* which is not the product of euphonic combination, if followed by *a* or a consonant

Of words exhibiting in *pada*-text, as well as in *samhita*, a final *o*, there are (apart from the theme *go*, which occurs only as first member of a compound, and therefore, by rule 2 of this chapter, does not require to be regarded in the determination of *pragrahas*) two classes, the one composed of vocatives from themes in *u*, the other of words whose final *a* or *ā* is combined with the particle *u*. The present rule deals, in general, with the former class, the one next following, with the latter class. The right of the vocatives in *o* to be treated as *pragrahas* is a very dubious one, and is not unequivocally supported by the Prāṭiśākhya, for to say that such words are *pragraha* before *a* or a consonant is not to distinguish them perceptibly from the euphonic *o* which comes from a final *as*, since this also is not capable of combination with a consonant, and does not necessarily absorb a following initial *a*. The only instances in which a vocative in *o* exhibits a *pragraha* character are the three which are cited under the next rule (i 4 27 v 7 2⁴. vi 5 8³), the cases in which it is regularly changed to *av* before other vowels than *a* are much more numerous namely, before *ā*, at i 4 39 ii 2 12⁴, 6 11¹ vi 4 3³, before *i*, at ii 2 12⁹, before *u*, at i 2 13² twice, 6 12³ iii 2 10¹, before *e*, at ii 4 12³. I have noted but two cases in the text where such an *o* stands before initial *a* without absorbing it, they are found at i 3 8¹, 14⁷. And there are the same

5 *ākārah padāntah sarvatra pragraho bhavati padasamaye vartamānah yathā hanū.... vās.... har.... padasamaye vartamāna iti kim sūtānāmīthāmākshū¹ (iii 14) ity ādh*

¹ G M omit after *mīthu*

6 *asāmhita okāro 'kāraparo vā¹ vyañjanaparo vā pragrahaḥ syāt yathā vad.... vish.... asāmhita iti kim so....: 'pra.... evampara iti kim² vish.... samhitānūmittaḥ sāmhitah na sāmhitō 'sāmhitah akārag ca vyañjanam cā 'kāravayañjane te pare yasmāt sa tatho 'ktaḥ*

¹ G M om ² W B O om

number of cases—namely, at ii 5 12⁵ and vi 4 3⁴—in which it causes the elision of a following *a*

The commentator's citations in illustration of the rule are *vad-mā hi suno usi* (i 3 14⁷), and *vishno havyañ rakshasva* (i 1 3). To show the necessity of the limitation *asāmhitah*, he cites *so 'bravīt* (ii 1 2¹ et al), and *pra so agne* (iii 2 11¹ omitted, however, by W B O), where *so* is the *sāmhitā* reading for *sah*, and, to show that the prescribed quality belongs to the vowel only before *a* or a consonant (the *lacuna* of W B O extends through this explanation), he gives us *vishnav e 'hī 'dam* (ii 4 12³)

For the teachings of the other Prāticākhyas respecting this class of asserted *pragrahas*, see the note to Ath Pr i 81

समहृदयपितृवश्च ॥ ७ ॥

7 As also, when preceded by *s*, *m*, *h*, *d*, *th*, and *p*it

The *anuvṛtti* of this rule is even more blind and equivocal than usual. Instead of bringing down either the subject or predicate of the one preceding, we are to bring down both, only with the exclusion of one of the modifications included in the former. The meaning is, that an original *o*, preceded as here specified, is *pragraha* even when followed by other vowels than *a*. The commentator is in error in saying that *ca* implies *okārah* from above, he should have said *okāro 'sāmhitah*

As above remarked, this rule chiefly concerns the class of *pragrahas* composed of words whose final vowel, *a* or *ā*, is combined with the particle *u*. Of these, *atho* is vastly the most numerous, occurring about two hundred and fifty times in the *Sanhitā*. Before *a* it is met with twenty times, always without occasioning elision, before other vowels, twenty-nine times, always uncombined. Along with it, *tatho* is had in view by the rule, as presenting a final *o* after *th* it is found but once, in the passage cited by the commentator (see below). The only word showing *o* after *s* is *so*, found only in two passages, as noted below. After *m*, we have *o* both in *mo* (in two passages, once before *śh*, at i 8 3, the other is cited by the commentator) and in *mo*, which latter is found only before *a* (iv 3 13⁶), and so does not necessarily come within the purview of the rule. The other words of the class occur before consonants alone, and are, therefore, here made no account of they are *o* (once, i 4 33), *to*

7 *pūrvoktaparanimittābhāve 'pi kāryavidhānārtham okāram viginashṭi cakāra okāram anvādiṣati sa ma ha da tha pū evampūro 'sāmhitā okāro 'kāravayāṅyābhhyām anyaparo 'pi pragraho bhavati yathā so---- mā---- upa---- in do ---- tatho---- sa---- evampūrva iti kim. 'cat---- asāmhitā iti kim' pra----*

(3) B om

(1.2 5² and vi.1 8⁶) and *uto* (five times), *upo* (four times), and *pro* (1.7 13⁵)

Of the remaining specifications of the rule, the *h* is made for but a single case of the exclamation *ho*, which the commentator quotes *upahūtāñs ho ity āha* (ii 8 7³), the *d* is for the vocative *indo*, which occurs twice *indo indriyāvatah* (1.4 27), and *indo ity āha* (vi.5 8³) the commentator quotes the latter passage, the *pt* is for the vocative *pito*, only found once, as cited *sa no mayobhāh pito ā viçasva* (v 7 2^{4 5} W B O omit the first three words) These three, as was noted under the preceding rule, are the only instances which the Sanhitā affords of vocatives in *o* showing an uncombinable quality

The commentator's explanation of the rule is "the *o* is here specially distinguished in order to the prescription of its quality even in the case of absence of the sequent determining circumstances before stated" As examples of words whose ending is combined with *u*, after the consonants specified, he gives *so evāñ 'shār 'tasya* (ii 2 9⁷, 5 5⁵), *mā bher māro mo eśhām* (iv 5 10¹), and *tatho eva 'ttare nir vapet* (iii 4 9⁷ W B O omit after *uttare*) His counter-examples are *çatakrataṃ ud vañçam iwa* (1.6 12³ G M omit *iwa*), and *pra so agne* (iii 2 11¹) but G M, which have given the latter passage under the preceding rule, here substitute for it *mā so asmāñ avahāya* (v 7 9¹), their separate application is manifest

The treatment by the Prātiçākhyā of words ending in *o* is awkward and bungling to a degree quite rare or wholly unknown elsewhere in its rules We should be justified in inferring from its statements that *o*, *to*, *uto*, *upo* and *pro* were not regarded as *pragrahas* at all, nor the vocatives in *o* except under the conditions and in the places specified, and that (if the commentator's explanation of rule 4 is accepted) they are not written with *iti* in the *pada* text while, doubtless, in every *pada*-text of the Black Yajus, as in those of the other Vedas, each word is treated uniformly, whether it happen to exhibit its uncombinable quality in *sanhitā* or not Through the rest of the chapter, it will be noticed, the words mentioned are defined as *pragrahas*, without regard to the circumstances in which they may stand in the text

अथैकारेकारौ ॥ ८ ॥

8 Now follow cases of *e* and *i*

This is a heading for the remainder of the chapter, excluding all other vowels than final *e* and *i* from the action of its rules The words exhibiting such finals are, of course, mainly duals, and are by the other treatises simply defined as such, with immense saving of trouble

8 *athe 'ty ayam adhikārah ekārekārāu pragrahatvena vidhīyete² ity etad³ adhikṛtam vedhavyam*

¹ G M *ekāra ikarah* ² W O *yate*, B *-yate*, G M *viçishyate* ³ G M om

अस्मे ॥ १ ॥

9 *Asme* is *pragraha*

The example cited by the commentator is, according to W B O, *asme te bandhuh* (127), according to G M, *sampatte gor asme candrāni* (also 127). Neither exhibits in *samhitā* the *pragraha* quality of the word, as is done at 1713⁵ and elsewhere. *asme* is not uncommon in the *Sanhitā*, occurring twenty-nine times

वे इत्यनिग्यातः ॥ १० ॥

10 Also *tve*, when not the final member of a separable compound

The office of the word *iti* in this rule is differently explained by the two versions of the commentary. W B O say that it indicates the quality of a separable cited word (they mean, doubtless, of an inseparable), G M, that it indicates *pragraha* quality. Each interpretation is as good, and as worthless, as the other. The commentary is not infrequently at much pains to put some special, even wonderful, significance into *iti* when found in a rule, and generally with as little acceptable result as here.

The pronoun *tve* occurs seven times in the *Sanhitā* (at 1314² 446¹ 111⁷, 510¹ 1427³, 654⁴ 118⁶), exhibiting its *pragraha*-quality in *samhitā* only once (at 1427³). The commentator's instance is *tve kratum api* (11510¹ G M omit *api*), and his counter-instance, to show the necessity of the restriction imposed in the rule, is *anāgāstve adititve turāsaḥ* (11111⁶ G M omit *turāsaḥ*), where the *pada*-text reads *anāgāh-tve aditi-tve*.

देवतेउभेभागधेऊर्ध्वेविशाखेभृङ्गेऽनेमेध्येतृषेतृद्येकनी-
निकेपाश्चेशिवेचोत्तमेऽवोत्तरेशिप्रेरथन्तरेवत्सरस्यद्वपेवि-
द्वपेविषुद्वपेसदोहविर्धानेअधिषवणेअहोरात्रेधृतव्रतेस्तुत-

9 *asme ity asmin*¹ *grahane 'ntyasvanah pragraho bhavati yathā asme----*

¹ G M *etasmim*

10 *itīśabda vṅgyagrahamatvam*¹ *dyotayati* · *anāvṅyāntas tve ity eśha śabdah pragraho bhavati yathā tve---- anāvṅyānta itī kim anā---- vṅgyasyā 'nta vṅyāntah, ne 'vṅyānto 'nāvṅyāntah.*

¹ G M *pragrahamatvam* T W B O write *ingy-* throughout

शस्त्रेभ्यस्सामेभ्यस्तेभ्यपि तेरैवतेपूर्तेप्रतेविधृतेभ्यनृतेभ्यद्वि-
बहुतेपूर्वजेकृणुध्वंसदने ॥ ११ ॥

11 Also *devate*, *ubhe*, *bhāgadhe*, *ūrdhve*, *viçākhe*, *gr̥nge*, *ene*, *medhye*, *tr̥ne*, *tr̥dye*, *kan̥inike*, *pārçve*, *cve*, *co 'ttame*, *evo 'ttare*, *cipre*, *rathamtare*, *vaṣṣarasya rūpe*, *virūpe*, *vishuvūpe*, *sadohavir-
dhāne*, *adhāshavane*, *ahorātre*, *dhr̥tavr̥ate*, *stutaçastre*, *r̥ksāme*, *akte*, *arp̥ite*, *rāvate*, *p̥ūte*, *pratte*, *vidh̥rte*, *anr̥te*, *achidre*, *bahule*, *pūrvaye*, *kr̥nudhvañ sadane*

For the *pragrahas* catalogued in this rule—all of them dual cases of feminines and neuters—the commentator quotes illustrative passages as follows. For *devate*, *devate samr̥ddhyāñ mān-
tram* (u 1 9³ the last word in G M only). For *ubhe*, G M have *achidre bahule ubhe vyacasvatī samvasāthām* (iv 1 3⁴), but W B O, blunderingly, *ime eva rasenā 'nakṣi* (vi 3 11³ B O have *ubhe* for *ime*) the word occurs also in other passages. For *bhāgadhe*, *bhāgadhe bhāgadhā asmān* (u 5 6⁶) also in the preceding division of the same *anuvāka*, and at v 5 9². As counter-example, to show that *dhe* (itself a *pada*, *bhāga-dhe*) would not have answered the purpose alone, we have *agna udadhe* (v 5 9¹ *pudatext*, *uda-dhe*). For *ūrdhve*, *ūrdhve samādhan̄ ā dadhātī* (u 6 6³ and vi 2 1⁶). For *viçākhe*, *viçākhe nakshatram* (iv 4 10²) and as counter-example, to show the necessity of including the *vi* (of *viçākhe*), we have *tasmint sahasraçākhe*, stated to be found “in the text of another school.” About a score of such alleged citations from “another text,” assumed to have been had in view by the authors of the Prāṭiśākhya in constructing their rules, are given in various parts of the commentary (five of them in the comment upon this rule) they will be put together, and their bearing discussed, in an additional note at the end of the work. For *gr̥nge*, *antarā gr̥nge tam devatāh* (vi 2 8⁴ only G M have *devatāh*) the word also occurs at i 2 14⁷. The next two words, *ene* and *medhye*, occur in the same passage, *medhye evāñ 'ne karotī* (vi 2 9¹), which the comment quotes, in W O giving *medhye* last, after the rest, by way of justifying the order in which the two words stand in the rule but B G M read the whole passage as it stands in the text, and G M make the rule read correspondingly *medhye ene* (T has, like the others, *ene medhye*) *Ene* is also found in one or

11 ----- *etāni padāni pragrahasamyāñāni¹ syuh² yathā dev-
---- achid----- bhāg----- bhāge³ 'ti kim agna----- ūr-
---- viç----- vī⁴ 'ti kim tas----- iti çākḥāntare⁵ ant-----
ev----- me----- asam----- sam----- yad----- pār-----
pit----- vik----- ce 'ti kim sam----- tatho----- eve 'ti
kim nāi----- pit----- yad----- samv----- sam-----
vish----- vaṣṣarasyavivishv⁶ iti kim arū----- 'rūpaçabdasya*

two other passages (iv 6 2⁴ vi 2 9¹ again, 3 9⁶) For *trnne, asam-trnne hi hanā atho khalu* (vi 2 11³ only G M have the last two words) For *trāye, samtrāye dhṛtyā* (vi 2 11³) For *kanīnke, yad atrātrāu kanīnke agnishtomāu yat* (vii 2 9¹ W B O begin at *kan-*) the same word occurs twice more in the next division For *pārṇve, pārṇve paraḥsamānah* (vii 3 10³) it is found a second time in the same division For *give, pitarah somyāsah give no dyāvāprthivī* (iv 6 6⁴ W B O begin at *give*) For *co'ttame, vikarnīm co'ttame upa dadhāti* (v 3 7³ only G M have the last two words) and, to show the necessity of the *ca*, *samvatsarāṇ sampādya'ttame māsi* (vii 5 3¹) For *evo'ttare, tatho evo'ttare nrvapet* (iii 4 9⁷) and, to show why *eva* had to be included in the rule, *nā 'ti shodasy uttare tena* (vii 1 4³ only G M have *tena*) For *ṣipre, pītā ṣipre avepayah* (i 4 30 W B O begin with *ṣipre*) For *rathamtare, yad brhadrathamtare anvarjeyuh* (vii 5 3² only G M have *yad*) the same compound occurs in several places elsewhere For *vatsarasya rūpe, samvatsarasya rūpe āpnuvanti* (vii 5 1⁴) For *virūpe, samanāsā virūpe dhāpayete* (iv 1 10⁴, 6 5², 7 12³) For *vishurūpe, vishurūpe ahanā dyāur vā 'si* (iv 1 11³ W B O stop with *ahanā*) The necessity of including in the rule, besides the *pada rūpe*, the words *vatsarasya*, *vishu* (of *vishu-rūpe*), and *vi* (of *vi-rūpe*) is proved by the citation of *arākṣhatam drṣṭa ā rūpe annam* (iv 3 13²), where *rūpe* is locative and the commentary adds the remark (wanting, however, in the South-Indian MSS), "the separate specification of the word *rūpa* is to be looked upon as for the sake of distinct enunciation" For *sadohāvirdhāne, sadohāvirdhāne eva sam minoti* (ii 5 5⁵) the compound occurs twice more, at vi 2 6², 5 1⁵ To justify the inclusion of *sadah*, the commentator quotes *uparavā havirdhāne khāyante* (vi 2 11¹), but the case appears to him one not to be so easily disposed of, and he enters into an elaborate discussion of it, which I defer to the end of this note, in order not to interrupt the connection For *adhishavane, hanā adhishavane jhivā* (vi 2 11⁴) it is also found in the preceding division of the same section, and at iv 7 8¹ The *adhi* is justified by reference to *savanesavane 'bhi grhnāti* (vi 4 11⁴, 6 11³) For *ahorātre, ahorātre prā 'viṣan* (i 5 9⁷) the word occurs not infrequently elsewhere The passage *atvātre paṇḍakāmasya* (vi 6 11⁴) is given to account for the inclusion of *ahah*, this implies, of course, that the Tāttvīya *pada*-text treats the word as a separable compound, *ahah-rātre* For *dhrtavrate, dyāvāprthivī dhrtavrate āvinā devī* (i 8 12² G M omit the last

pratviṣeshanam uccāranavispashtārtham⁸ drashtavyam¹ sad-
---- sada iti kim up----- nanu padagrahaneṣhu pa-
dam gamyetu (i 50) *iti sāmāthyād 'dhāvirdhāne ity ekapada-*
syā 'va kāryasiddhik sadahpadam vyartham mān 'vam pa-
dagrahane sthālāntare¹⁰ bhinnarūpasya¹¹ sambhāvanādyām⁹ vi-
ṣeshanān sārthakam bhavati¹² bhinnarūpatvābhāve tu codyam
etaḥ bhavet¹³ nanu tarhi devate iti padagrahanasya sthālāntare¹⁴

word), and, to account for the inclusion of *dhṛta*, *yasya vrate* *pushtipatīh* (III 1 11³) For *stutaṣṭre*, *stutaṣṭre evā 'tena duhe* (V 6 8⁶ G M omit the last word) it occurs again at VII 3 13 This time, resort is had to "another text" (*gākhāntaram*) for a passage to explain why the rule does not say simply *ṣṭre* it is *ūrdhve ṣṭre pratishthite* For *rksāme*, *rksāme vā devebhyah* (VI 1 8¹) the word is found twice in this division, and also at VI 5 9², 6 7⁴ Here, again, a passage in "another text," *brahma sāme pratishthite* (G M omit the last word, and B O omit the *sā* of *sāme*), is appealed to in justification of the *rk* For *akte*, *purāravā ghrtenā 'kte vrshanam dadhāthām* (I 3 7¹ and [except *purāravāh*] VI 3 5³ W B O omit the first word, B also the last) For *arpate*, *dṛāvāprthavi bhuvaneshv arpate* (IV 7 13² only G M have the first word) For *rāvate*, *śākhārārdivate sāmanī* (I 8 13² and IV 4 2³) the same compound is found again at IV 3 2³ For *pārte*, the different recensions give different examples W B O have *ištāpārte sañ sṛjethām* (IV 7 13⁵), G M, *ištāpārte kṛnūtāt* (V 7 7²) I have noted no other cases for the treatment of the word in the *pada*-text see the note to III 6 For *pratte*, *pratte kāmam annādyam duhāte* (V 4 9³ G M omit the last word) For *vidhrte*, again, W B O have *vidhrte sarvatah* (VI 4 10³), and G M *tasmān nāsikayā cakshurhī vidhrte samānī* (II 3 8²), and the *vi* is justified by an alleged citation from "another text," *agnidhrte* (G M, however, omitting the *agn*, thus leaving it to be understood that the simple word *dhṛte* is found elsewhere not *pragraha*) For *anrte*, *satyānrte avapacyan* (V 6 1¹) For *achidre*, *achidre bahule ubhe* (IV 1 3² only G M have *ubhe*), which answers also for *bahule* it is the only passage containing either word For *pārvaḥ*, *pārvaḥ pitarā navyasibhīh* (IV 1 11⁴ W B O omit the last word) another passage beginning with the same word is the subject of rule 23 of this chapter Once more a word, *prathamaje*, is cited from "another text," in order to explain why the rule does not say simply *je* (since the *pada*-text writes *pārvaḥ je*) For *kṛnudhvañ sadane*, finally, we have the sole passage in which it occurs, *gīrbhīh kṛnudhvañ sadane rtasya* (IV 1 11⁴ G M omit *rtasya*), with the counter example *apām tvā sadane śādayāmi* (IV 3 1 G M omit the last word), to show the necessity of *kṛnudhnam*

To return, now, to the long word *sadohaviṛdhāne* The objection is raised, that its part *sadaḥ* is unnecessary, and that it would

soma.... iti bhinnarūpatvād¹⁵ viśeshanena bhavitavyam tac ca nā'sti ucyate devate ity akhandapadasyai 'va kāryaviṛdhānād atra viśeshanam na yugyate akhandaviṛdhānam¹⁶ iti katham pratiyate te ity asya te m ā pātam (IV 42) ity ādina prthakkarandā iti brūmah nā¹⁷ 'vam havirṛdhāne¹⁸ ity asyā¹⁹ 'khandatvadyotakam²⁰ kimcid apy²¹ asti yena sadahpadavākyarthiyam ālambate²² hanā.... adhī 'ti kim sav-.... aho-.... ahar iti kim atv-.... dyāv-....: dhṛte 'ti kim yasya.... str-

have been sufficient to say *havirḍhāne* simply, for rule 150 teaches us that, in citations of *padas*, the cited *pada* alone is to be understood, not any collocation of words or letters phonetically equivalent with it and *havirḍhāne* is here a single *pada* (the compound being divided *sadah-havirḍhāne*, while its latter member, occurring by itself as a non-*pragraha*, is written *havirḍhāne*, and so is a congeries of two *padas*) It is replied not so, a distinctive addition is properly made to a cited *pada*, in case of its occurrence in a different form in another passage, though the objection would hold good, were it not for such occurrence in a different form. But this explanation is not suffered to pass without challenge. In that case, retorts the objector, a distinction ought to be added to *devate*, because it occurs elsewhere in a different form (made up of two independent words), as in *soma deva te matividaḥ* (iii 25^{2,3}), and no such addition is made. The answer is, that no distinction need here be applied to *devate*, because its treatment is defined as of an undivided word and, if you ask how its indivisibility is established, we reply that rule 42, below, treats of *te* as a separate *pada* in the various situations in which it is *pragraha* [whence the inference is clear that it is here an inseparable part of the word *devate*], while there is nothing whatever to show in like manner the indivisibility of *havirḍhāne*, and so to prove the addition of *sadah* superfluous. The implication is, that if the *pada* *dhāne* happened to be described elsewhere as *pragraha* after certain other *padas*, of which *havir* was not one, then we could be sure that *havirḍhāne* here meant a single undivided *pada*, and its mention by itself would be enough, while, as things are, one cannot be certain that its part *havir* is not, like the *vi* and *vishu* of *vivṛape* and *vishurūpe*, a distinctive addition.

अमीचक्षुषीकाष्णिदिवताफल्गुनीमुष्टीधीनामीवपाश्र-
पणीअरुनीजन्मनीसुम्निनीसामनीविष्णावरेक्षवीद्वीद्या-
वापृथिवी ॥ १२ ॥

---- *strute* 'ti *kim* *ūrdh*---- *iti śākhāntare rks*---- *rg* *iti*
kim *brah*---- *iti śākhāntare pur*---- *dyāv*---- *śākh*
---- *isht*---- *prat*---- *vidh*---- *vī* 'ti *kim* *agn* *iti śā*
khāntare ¹³*saty*---- *ach*---- *pūrv*---- *pūrve* 'ti *kim*
prath *iti śākhāntare* ²³*gīr*---- *krnudhvam* *iti kim* *apām*

1 O *pragrhyas*- 2 G M *bhavanā* 3 G M *bhāgādhe* 4 G M *viśakhe* 5 G
M *ram* 6 W O *vatsaraviv* 7 G M om 8 B *nam vi*, W O *-tha* 9 G
M om 10 MSS *sthal*- 11 W *patvam* 12 B G M om 13 G M om 14 B
sthal- 15 W B O *abh*- 16 B O *nditav* 17 W B O *mar* 18 W B O *sadoh*
19 W *asā*, B *ā*, O om 20 W B O *ms na* 21 W B O *tathā* 22 B *-nibhyate*
O *-mbhyate*, G M *āpadyate* (23) B om

12 Also *amī cakshushī, kārshnī, devatā phalgunī, mushtī, dhī, nābhī, vapācraṇanī, ahanī, janmanī, sumnūnī, sāmānī, vāishnavī, ākshavī, darvī, dyāvāprthivī*

The illustrative passages cited under this rule are as follows. For *amī*, according to W B O, *amī vā idam abhāvun* (III 3 7¹), but according to G M, *amī tvā jahati* (III 2 11³). I have noted elsewhere only VI 1 5⁴. For *cakshushī, cakshushī vā ete yajñasya* (II 6 2¹ et al. G M omit *yajñasya*) the word occurs about a dozen times. For *kārshnī, kārshnī upānahāv upa muñcate* (V 4 4⁴, 6 6¹ G M omit the last two words). For *phalgunī, pitaro devatā phalgunī nakshatram* (IV 4 10¹) again in the next division of the same section. To show the necessity of including *devatā* in the rule, is given *yad dvitīyaṁ sā phalgunī* (II 1 2²). For *mushtī, mushtī karoti vācam* (V 2 1⁷ and VI 1 4³ G M omit *vācam*). For *dhī, pradhī tāv ukthya madhye* (VII 4 11² G M omit *madhye*). For *nābhī, rajatanābhī vācivadevāu* (V 5 24). For *vapācraṇanī, vapācraṇanī pra harati* (VI 3 9⁶) it occurs also in the fourth division of the same section. As counter-example, to explain the presence of *vapā* in the rule, is given, "from another text," the compound *paṇḍrapanī* (or, as G M read, *bhasma-craṇanī*) our Saṁhitā has *paṇḍrapanam* at III 1 3². For *ahanī, ahanī dyāvur vā 'sī* (IV 1 11⁸). For *janmanī, ubhe nī pāsī janmanī* (I 4 22). For *sumnūnī, sumnūya sumnūnī* (I 1 13³). For *sāmānī, sāmānī pratishthitayāu* (IV 4 2³) also at I 8 13². For *vāishnavī, valagahanāu vāishnavī brhann asī* (I 3 2² only G M have the last two words). For *ākshavī, ākshavī tiragē* (VI 2 1⁶ twice). For *darvī, darvī grāmisha āsanī* (II 2 12⁷ and IV 4 4⁶). For *dyāvāprthivī, dyāvāprthivī eva svena* (II 1 4⁷) the word is frequently found elsewhere. The commentator gives us here also a counter-example, *mahī dyāvuh prthivī ca nah* (III 3 10² et al. G M omit *ca nah*), as if the inclusion of *dyāvā* required justification but, in ordinary Vedic usage (I have omitted to inform myself in season respecting that of the Taittirīya *pada*-text), *dyāvāprthivī* is inseparable, and therefore itself a single *pada*.

पूर्वश्च ॥ १३ ॥

13 As also, the preceding word

That is to say (by the application of rule 158), the word preceding the last one mentioned in the rule next above, or *dyāvāprthivī*—

12 ----- ¹ *etāna padāna pragrahasanyūdāna syuh² yathā³*
amī.... caksh-.... kārsh-.... pīt-.... devate 'ti kim
yad.... mush-.... pra-.... raj-.... vap-.... vape 'ti
kim paṇ-.... itī śākhāntare ah-.... ubhe.... sum-....
sām-.... vat-.... āksh-.... dar-.... dyāv-.... dyāve
'ti kim mahī....

¹ G M ins *it* ² G M O *bhavanā* ³ W B O om

15 4⁴ To account for the *ā* in this word, G M simply cites *huti* as found in "another text" but W B O give the phrase *huti tasmād evāh* (but W O read *hūti*, and B *ddhati* W also has *vivā iti* instead of *evā iti*)

पूर्वश्च ॥ १६ ॥

16 As also, the preceding word

Namely *ete*, occurring before *āhuti* in the passage already quoted *purodācam ete āhuti* (15 2³ W B O here omit the first word)

वाससीतपसीरोदसी ॥ १७ ॥

17 Also *vāsasī*, *tapasī*, and *rodasī*

The examples are *vāsasī va vvasāndu* (15 10¹, the word is also found at 18 18), *sāksṣhād eva dīkshātāpasī avā rundhe* (v1 1 1² the compound occurs again in the same division only G M have the first two words), and *ime vāi rodasī tayoh* (v1 5⁴ G M have dropped out *vāi*) the word is not rarely met with elsewhere

परश्च ॥ १८ ॥

18 As also, the following word

The passage contemplated by the rule is, as cited in the comment, *anv indrañ rodasī vāvaṣāne* (17 18¹) there is, I believe, no other falling under it

15 ----- ¹ *eteshv antyasvarah² pragrahah syāt³ harī----*
sah----- se 'ti kim tam----- iti śākhāntare sah----- se 'ti
kim hūti----- iti śākhāntare adhva----- yuñjā----- 'e 'ti⁴
kim prsh----- puro----- e 'ti kim huti----- iti śākhāntare

¹ G M *ms ity* ² B O *antyah sv-* ³ G M *bhavati* ⁴ G M *ikarena*

16 *cakārānvādēśād¹ āhuti ity etasmāt pārva² ikāra ekāro vā padāntah³ pragraho bhavati yathā pur-----*

¹ G M *-anvādshita* ² G M *om*

17 ¹----- *ity etāni pragrahasamyjāni bhavanti¹ yathā.*
vās----- sāk----- ime-----

¹ G M *eshv antyasvarah pragraho bhavati*

18 *cakārānvādīshitarodasī¹ ity etasmāt para² ikāra ekāro vā padāntah³ pragraho bhavati yathā anv-----*

¹ G M *-tad rō* ² G M *om*

व्यचस्वतीभरिष्यन्तीनःपृथिवी ॥ ११ ॥

19 Also *vyacasvatī*, *bharishyanti*, and *naḥ prthivī*

The examples are *vyacasvatī sam vasāthām* (iv 1 3²), *agnim antar bharishyanti jyotishmantam* (iv 1 3² G alone has the last word), and *dyāvā naḥ prthivī imaṁ sūdhram* (iv 1 11⁴). The needed counter-example for the last is supplied by *rejate agne prthivī makhebbhyah* (iv 1 11⁴).

येमप्रथेतामुर्वीतेमस्ययंक्रन्दसीहृन्दस्वतीतिआचरन्तीअन्तरैतासु ॥ २० ॥

20 Also in the verses beginning *ye aprathetām*, *urvī*, *te asya*, *yam krandasī*, *chandasvatī*, *te ācaranti*, and *antarā*

The commentator cites only the beginning of each verse, as a word with *pragraha* final occurs at or near the beginning in every case. Thus *ye aprathetām amutebhah* (iv 7 15⁶ there are three other cases of *pragrahas* in the verse) with the counter-example *ye te panthānah* (vii 5,24), to show that *ye* alone would not have defined the verse, *urvī rodasī varivah* (iv 7 15⁶ G M omit the last word three cases, besides *rodasī*, already disposed of by rule 17), *te asya yoshane* (iv 1 8² one more case the *te* is therefore made no account of in rule 42, below) with the counter-example *te vardhanta svatavaso nahitvanā* (iv 1 11³), to show the necessity of *asya*, *yam krandasī avasā* (iv 1 8⁵ contains two other cases) and, as counter-example, for a like purpose, *yam agne prtsu martyam* (i 3 13²), *chandasvatī ushasā* (iv 3 11¹ it contains seven cases), *te ācaranti* (iv 6 6² also seven cases) with *te no arvanto havanacrutah* (i 7 8²) as counter-example, to prove that *te* alone would not be enough, and, finally, *antarā mitrāvarunā caranti* (v 1 11² with four cases)

नोपस्थे ॥ २१ ॥

21 But not *upasthe*

19 ----- 'eteshv¹ antyasvarah² padāntah³ pragraho bhavati yathā vyac----- agn----- dyāvā-----⁴ na iti kim rej-----

¹ G eshv ² B tyah sv ³ G om ⁴ M om

20 ----- etāsv rkshv ikāra ekāro¹ vā padāntah pragraho bhavati yathā ye----- aprathetām iti kim ye te----- urvī----- te----- asye 'iti kim te 'v----- yam----- krandasī iti kim yam----- chand----- te ā----- ācaranti iti kim te no----- ant-----

¹ G M put before *ikāro*

That is to say, *upasthe* is exempted from the action of the preceding rule it occurs but once in the verses forming the subject of that rule, namely in *mūte 'va putram bibhrtām upasthe* (in the verse beginning *te ācarantī*, IV 6 6² W B O give only the last two words) To show that *sthe* would not have sufficiently defined the exception (*upa-sthe*), the commentator quotes *ye pratishthe* (*prati-sthe*) *abhavatām* (from the verse beginning with *urvī*, IV 7 15⁶)

इरावतीप्रभृत्या दाधार ॥ २२ ॥

22 Also in the passage beginning with *irāvati* and ending with *lādhāra*

The passage in question is found at 1.2 13², and contains six *pragrahas*, whereof one, *rodasī*, needs no further provision than was made in rule 17, above, it also contains a word in *e*, *manave*, which is not *pragraha*, being excepted by rule 54 The commentator quotes its beginning, *irāvati dhenumatī hi bhātām*

पूर्वज्ञेप्रभृत्यायम् ॥ २३ ॥

23 And in the passage beginning with *pūrvaje* and ending with *ayam*

Of this passage, found at 1.6 7⁵, the commentator quotes the first four words In order to the better understanding of the following discussion, I set it down here in full, along with the word that precedes it *hwayate pūrvaje rtāvarī ity āha pūrvaje hy ete rtāvarī devī devaputre ity āha devī hy ete devaputre upahāto 'yam* It contains ten *pragraha* endings, of which, however, two (*pūrvaje*) fall under rule 11, above The word *ā*, 'as far as,' in the rule, is declared here to exclude the two limiting words mentioned (com-

21 *etāsv rkshā 'pasthe ity antyasvarah¹ padāntah² pragraho na bhavati yathā māt----- upe 'ti kim ye----*

¹ B O *antah sv* ² G M om

22 *irāvatiṣprabhrtī 'rāvati itī¹ śabdām ārabhyā² "dādhāra dādhāraṣabdāparyantam³ ikāra ekāro vā padāntah pragraho bhavati yathā irā-----*

¹ G M om ² W B O *paryantam*

23 *pūrvajeṣprabhrtīyayamparyantam¹ ikāra ekāro vā padāntah pragraho bhavati yathā² pūrv----- ānpadam³ maryādāyām vartate nanu pūrv----- ity ārabhyā⁴ 'yam----- ity etatparyantam sthālam⁴ etatsūtravishayaḥ⁵ kim na syāt ucyate bhavatapakṣa upabandhāntahpātivrāt⁶ krnudhvañ sadane (IV.11) itī grahanasya⁷ vānyarthayam⁸ syāt tan⁸ mā bhūd itī tasmād*

pare Pāṇini II 1 13)—an arbitrary restriction, directly opposed by the analogy of the preceding rule, intended, doubtless, to relieve the treatise of the reproach of declaring the word *pūrvaye* a *pragraha* by two separate rules, but this is a small gain, since the same word occurs a second time in the passage, and cannot there be reached by any such device

A protracted, not to say tedious, discussion now arises, respecting the sufficiency and propriety of the rule as stated. The first objection is how do we know that the passage had in view by the rule is not that which begins with *pūrvaye putarā* (IV 1 11⁴) and ends with *ayam purobhuvah* (IV 3 2¹ B O omit *bhuvah*). Because, it is answered, the special citation (in rule 11) of *krnu-dhvañ sadane* (IV 1 11⁴), which occurs within the limits mentioned, would in that case be rendered superfluous. Objection second: the word *pūrvaye*, at any rate, is useless, it having been already made *pragraha* by rule 11, the rule should read “beginning with *vari*” (the concluding *pada* of the separable compound *ritavari*). This, too, is repelled: the rule reads as it stands because *vari* occurs twice in the passage, and the question would arise where the defined limit should be understood to be: moreover, as we are taught (I 25) in case of doubt to take the nearest, we should have to assume as intended the latter of the two, as being nearer to the other specified limit in which case we should arrive at the untoward result that the *pragraha* character of the first *vari* would not be established at all. But now the objector triumphantly retorts, that there are also two instances of *pūrvaye*, and a like doubt as in the supposition last made would arise as to the identity of the one cited, and a like untoward result as was pointed out in connection therewith. Not so, is the defense: *pūrvaye* is not desig-

etat⁰ sthalam etatsūtravishayo na bhavati nanv atra pūrvajegrahanam anarthakam pūrvajekrnu dhvañsadane (IV 11) *iti tatrān 'vo 'ktatvāt¹⁰ kim tu¹⁰ variprabhrti¹¹ etāvatār 'vā 'lam ne 'ti brāmah varigrahanadvayasambhavāt kutra vā 'vadhinyamatvena¹² svikāra¹³ iti samdehah syāt kim ca āsannañ samdehe* (I 25) *iti vacanād uttarādvadhisamnikrshito¹⁴ dvitīyavarīcābda eva svikartavyah tathā sati pūrvavarīcābdasya¹⁵ pragrahatvam na syāt tac cā 'nishtam nanu bhavanmate 'pi pūrvajadvayasambhavāt kutra vā grahanam iti samdehah samānah kim ca yuktyuktam¹⁶ anishtam ca¹⁷ samānam¹⁸ mān 'van pūrvaye iti padam atra kāryabhāktvena¹⁹ no 'cyate²⁰ yena pūrvajadvayasambhavāt bhavet kim tu pūrvaj cā 'sāu jēcābdaś ca pūrvaye etatprabhrti²¹ ty²¹ upalakshakatveno²² cyate²⁰ nanu tarhi²³ upahāta iti padam atikramyā 'yam ity avadhātvena kimartham²⁴ ucyate²⁴ upahāta iti padānām bāhulye²⁵ 'py āsannañ samdehe* (I 25) *iti vacanād prāthamīkasyār 'va grahanasiddhi²⁷ mān 'vam²⁵ upahāta iti padagrahane²⁸ tatra²⁹ gauravadoshah*

nated by the rule as a word possessing the defined quality—which would indeed be a superfluous repetition (in view of rule 11), but it means ‘the former *je* of the two,’ and is given merely as a convenient limit to count forward from¹ Again why, at the end of the passage, is *ayam* pitched upon as limit, to the neglect of *upahātah*, for, though this word is found several times in the immediate sequel, yet, in virtue of the principle already appealed to, “in case of doubt, take the nearest” (125), its first occurrence would be distinctly enough the one intended This also is disallowed to quote the whole compound word *upahātah* (*pada*-text, *upa-hātah*) would be to incur the charge of excess, and as for *upa* by itself, the first member of the compound, though it be a *pada*, its *pada* quality is of secondary rank, while that of *ayam* is primary [the latter being a complete word, but the former only a somewhat artificially separated portion of such], hence, on the principle “where there is a primary, a secondary is not in place,” it was proper to cite *ayam* The answer, however, suggests the further objection that, on the same principle, the first limit is unsuitable [*je* being also a fragment of a word, and its predecessor *hvayate* should have been taken instead] That cannot be made good, is the reply, for there a want of suitability in the primary word suggested if you take the primary *hvayate*, then, on the supposition that the definition of limits is to be understood inclusively [*ā* being susceptible of both an inclusive and an exclusive interpretation], this word [as it ends in *e*] will appear to be cited as a *pragraha* which is wrong And if you urge that rule 54 of the chapter annuls this false inference, we reply that, on the principle “not to touch filth is far better than to wash it off,” it is better not

upe 'ty *etāvanmātrasyā* "dibhātasyā"²⁰ 'ngasya²¹ *padatvaṇ gāru-*
nam *ayam* *ity asya tu*²² *mukhyam mukhye sambhavati na ga-*
nam *iti nyāyād* *ayam* *iti yuktam grahamam* *nanv etenā* 'va
nyāyenā "dyāvudher"²³ *anupapannatā nā* 'yam *pakṣah mu-*
*khyasambhavābhāvāt*²⁴ *tathā hi* *hvayata* *iti mukhye svikrte*
'bhviṇḍhinyāyena tasyā 'pi *grahanam*²⁵ *syāt* *tac oā* 'nśitam
ate samānapade (17 54) *iti vacanād etad*²⁶ *anīṣtam nā*²⁷ *bha-*
vati 'ti²⁸ *cet* *prakṣhālanād dhi pañkasya dūrād asparṣanam*
varam *iti nyāyād* *dhvayata* *ity uccārya tasya nīṣedhakathanād*
api tadānuccāranam *eva ramanīyam*²⁹ *iti mukhyasambhavā-*
bhāvo 'vasthā³⁰ *eva* *tasmād asmiṇi sūtre* 'nupapattileṣo *nā* 'sti

¹ W O *ti ā* *ayam*, B *ti* *ayam* ² B O G M om ³ G M ins *idam* ⁴ B O om
⁵ B O *sutr*-, G M *-yam* ⁶ W ins *purvaye* ⁷ W *pragrahasya* ⁸ W B O
om ⁹ G M om ¹⁰ B om ¹¹ W B *rtāvar*-, ¹² W *vidh*-, G M *-āritvena*
¹³ G M *svikrīyata* ¹⁴ G M *uktān* ¹⁵ G M ins *ca* ¹⁶ W O *yuktvyuktam*,
G M *yad uktam* ¹⁷ G M om ¹⁸ B O *tulyam* ¹⁹ B O *-tve* ²⁰ B om
²¹ G M om ²² G V *-kṣhanat*-, ²³ G M om ²⁴ G M *kṛm* ²⁵ B om ²⁶ G
M ins *iti* ²⁷ G M *-dheh* ²⁸ G M om *pada* ²⁹ G M *sūtra* ³⁰ W G M om
³¹ W 'nāpādasya, G M *ingyan*-, ³² G M om ³³ B O *-dyapadasya* ³⁴ O G
M *-khye* s- ³⁵ G M *pragrahatvam* ³⁶ G M *tad* ³⁷ G M om ³⁸ G M om
iti ³⁹ W *svar*-, B O *varam* ⁴⁰ G M *tadav*

to quote *hwayate* at all than to quote it and then make it the subject of an exception. The case, then, is one where no suitable primary word is to be found, and not the slightest charge of impropriety can be maintained against the rule as given.

Both parties to this controversy are about equally open to the charge of hair-splitting absurdity, but the objector must be acknowledged to have the right of it so far as this—that the rule is really ambiguous, considering the presence of the two words *pūrvaye*. That *pūrvaye*, as used in it, means ‘the former *je*,’ I do not at all believe.

इमे गर्भमुपैवसेनपरः ॥ २४ ॥

24 Also *ime*, when followed by *garbham*, *upa*, and *eva rasena*

The passages referred to are *yad ime garbham adadhātām* (III 4 3² G M omit the last word), *ime upāvartsyatah* (VI 1 3¹), and *ime eva rasena nakti* (VI 3 11³). Two counter-examples are given: one to show the necessity of *rasena* after *eva*, *ima evā smā lokāh* (II 4 10³), and one to show in general the need of specifying the situations in which *ime* is *pragraha*, *adhvartavyā vā ime devāh* (III 2 2³).

क्रूरमापःसजृब्रह्मज्ञैतेषु च ॥ २५ ॥

25 As also, in the sections beginning with *krūram*, *āpah*, *sayūh*, and *brahma ja*

That is to say, *ime* in the sections specified is always *pragraha*, even when otherwise followed than by the words mentioned in the preceding rule. The commentator quotes the beginning words of each section, and a single example from each: thus, from the section *krūram va vāḥ* (V 1 5 only G M have the last two words), *rodasyor ity āhe ime vā rodasi* (V 1 5⁴ the only case in the sec-

24 *ime ity antyasvaro garbhah upa eva rasena evamparah padāntah¹ pragrahah syāti yathā yad----* *ime----* *ime----* *rasene²ti kim ima----* *evampara iti kim adhv-----*

¹ G M om

25 *ime iti caṣaḍbdo¹ nvaḍiṣati krūram āpah sayūh brahma ja² eteshv anuvāḍkeshv ime ity antyasvarah pūrvoktaparanimat-tābhāve³ pi pragraho bhavati krū----- ity atra yathā⁴ rod----- āpo----- ity atre⁵ ime-----⁶ saj----- ity atra yathā⁷ etaṣa----- brah----- ity atra yathā na----- je⁸ti kim brah----- ity atra trayā --- ity asya⁹ pragrahatvam mā bhāḍ it*

¹ G M put before *ime* ² W *nāḍneshu* ³ G M om *para*. ⁴ B O om ⁵ B O G M om ⁶ B om, G M *atra*.

tion B O begin the citation at *ime*), from the section *āpo varu-
nasya patnayah* (v 5 4 G M omit the last word), *ime evo 'pa
dhatte* (v 5 4¹ there are two more cases in the following divisions),
from the section *sayār abdah* (v 6 4 G M omit the last word),
etaṣa ime aṣvinaḥ samvatsarah (v 6 4¹ the only case only G M
have the first word), from the section *brahma jayānam* (v 2 7),
nā hi 'me yajushā 'ptum arhati (v 2 7⁴ the only case B O omit
the last word) The last calls for a counter-example, to show the
need of including in the rule the syllable after *brahma* there is
another section beginning *brahmanā vādantya adbhah* (v 6 5
B O omit *adbhah*), which contains an *ime* not *pragraha* *traya
ime lokāh* (v 6 5³ only G M have *trayah*)

पूर्णं च ॥ २६ ॥

26 As also *pūrne*

The *ca*, 'and,' in this rule merely brings down the heading of
the last *anuvāka* named in the one preceding In that *anuvāka*,
pūrne is *pragraha* to wit, in *pūrne upa dadhāte pūrne eva 'nam*
(v 2 7⁴), but not elsewhere, as for example in *yo vā pūrna dśi-
cati* (vu 5 6¹)

दृढे ॥ २७ ॥

27 Also *drdhe* is *pragraha*

The restrictions imposed in previous rules no longer hold good
drdhe is *pragraha* wherever met with The example given is *yena
dyāvur ugrā pithvī ca drdhe* (iv 1 8⁵) There is another case at
iu 2 4³

घृचक्रे पपरे ॥ २८ ॥

28 Also *ghnî* and *cakre*, when followed by *p*

26 *caṣabdo brahmayajñānam ity anvādicati pūrne ity antya-
svaro brahmayajñānam ity anvāke pragraho bhavati yathā¹
pūrne-----²asmann anvāka³ iti kim yo----*

¹ B O G M om ² B O *brahmayaj*

27 *drdhe ity asmānn¹ antyasvarah sarvatra² pragraho bhavati
yathā³ yena----*

¹ B O om ² B O om ³ B O G M om

28 *ghnî cakre ity¹ ete pade papare pragrahe² bhavatah
vār----- cakre----- papare iti kim yad----- sam-----
ghnîcakre iti kim çak----- ye----- pakārah³ paro yābhyān
te papare*

¹ G M om ² G M *-grhye* ³ W *pah*

The examples are *vārtraghnī pūrnāmāse* (11 5 2⁵), *cakre prsthāni* (vi 6 8¹) I have noted no other cases. We have then two pairs of counter-examples, to show that these words are *pragraha* before *p* only, and only these words before *p* the first pair are *yad virūpayā vārtraghnī syāt* (vi 1 6⁷) and *samadhāna cakre nīcā tam* (12 14² only W has *tam*), the second, *çakā bhāumī pān-trah* (v 5 18) and *yeshām iṣe paçupatīh* (11.1 4^{1 2})

न्वती ॥ २९ ॥

29 Also *nvatī*

Two examples are cited *omanvatī te 'smin* (11 6 9⁵ G M omit the last two words), and *vrdhanvatī amāvāsyāyām* (11 5 2⁵) also a counter-example, proving that *vatī* alone would not have been sufficient *karnakāvaty etayā* (v 4 7³)

पपरो न ॥ ३० ॥

30 But not when followed by *p*.

The case here excepted—the only one, so far as I have noticed—is *mūrdhanvatī puronuvākyā bhavati* (11 6 2² G M omit the last word)

समीची ॥ ३१ ॥

31 *Samīcī* is *pragraha*

For this word, G M cite *samīcī retah svācatah* (v 5 4²), B O cite *paçcāt samīcī tābhah* (v 2 3⁵), W gives both passages. The word is met with a dozen times or more in the *Sanhitā*

नपरो न ॥ ३२ ॥

29 *nvatī ity antyasvarah¹ pragraho bhavati yathā² om----*
vrdh----- nakārena kim karn-----

¹ B *antah s-*, O *antas* ² B O G M om

30 *sāmnudhyāt nvatī itī¹ labhīyate. paparo nvatī ity² antya-*
svarah³ pragraho na bhavati yathā⁴ mūr-----

¹ O om ² B om ³ B *antah s*, O *antas-* ⁴ B O G M om

31 *samīcī ity antyasvarah¹ pragraho bhavati yathā² sam-*
---- paç-----

¹ B *antas-*, O *antyah s* ² B O G M om

32 *sāmnudhyāt samīcī itī labhīyate na khalu samīcī ity antya-*
svaro nakāraparah¹ pragraho bhavati yathā² sam-----

¹ G M om ² W G M om

32 But not when followed by *n*

The case excepted is *samīci nāmā 'si* (v 5 10¹) I have noted no other

चो यत्प्रपरः ॥ ३३ ॥

33 *Ō* is *pragraha*, when followed by *yat* or *pra*

The passages had in view by this rule are *ākṣhavi tvaçcē yad āgavālah* (v.1.2 1⁵ W O omit the first word, G M B the last, and B has the citation out of place, after the next but one), and *prāci pretam adhvaram* (1.2 13² and v.1.2 9³), besides two other cases before *pra* at v.1.2 1⁵, 3 9⁶. The commentator gives in addition a number of counter-examples to show that *cī* is not always *pragraha*, *prāci dīçām* (iv 3 3¹ et al but W B O read instead *yā prāci dik*, which is not to be found in the Saṁhitā *prāci dik*, without *yā*, occurs at several places, e g iv 3 6²), to prove the necessity of the *t* of *yat* and the *r* of *pra*, *gāur ghrtācī yajño devān yagātī* (1.5 7⁴ only G M have the last two words) and *tas-māt paçcāt prāci patny anv āste* (v 3 7³ only G M have the first two words), to indicate that other endings than *cī* are not *pragraha* in the situations specified, *yad agnir vajra ekādāçinī yad agnāu* (v 5 7¹ only G M have the first three words) and *prajanane prajananañ hi vāu* (1.5 9¹ only G M have the last two words)

आन्मही ॥ ३४ ॥

34 Also *ān mahī*

The passage is *māhān mahī astabhāyat* (1.3 14⁶) Elsewhere, *mahī* is not *pragraha* e g in *mahī dyāuḥ prthivī ca nah* (1.3 10² et al G M omit the last two words), and even after *n* preceded by any other vowel than *ā* e g in *vayunāvīd eka in mahī devasyu* (1.2 13¹ and iv 1 11² G M omit the last word)

पतो श्रुतिः ॥ ३५ ॥

33 *cī ity antyasvaro yatparah praparo vā pragrahah syāt'*
yathā' ākṣh-.... prā-.... evampara iti kim prā-.... ta-
kārarephābhyaṁ kim gāur-.... tas-.... cī 'ti kim yad-....
praj-....

¹ G M bhavah ² G M om

34 *ān ity etadvigṣhte mahīgrahane 'ntyasvarah pragrahah*
syāt' yathā māt-.... ān iti kim mahī-.... ākārena kim.
vay-....

¹ G M bhavati

35 Also the combination of sounds *patī*

The commentator explains wherever there is *gruti*,¹ e 'hearing,' of *patī*, there we are to understand a case of *pragraha*-quality. Hitherto we have been dealing only with *padas*, or complete individual words, but the *i* of *patī* is uncombinable, even when that audible combination is only a part of a *pada*. The selected examples are, first, *dvāu patī vīndate* (vi 6 4³) and *subhas patī vīdam uham* (iii 2 10² only G M have the last word), where *patī* is a *pada*, then *yam ācurā dāmpatī vāmam agnutaḥ* (iii 2 8⁴ only G M have the first two words) and *priyam indī ābrhaspatī* (iii 3 11¹), where it is part of a *pada* there are a few other cases.

It is remarked at the end of the comment, that, from this rule on, parts of words are also subjects of prescription of *pragraha*-quality.

ग्री ॥ ३६ ॥

36 Also *gnī*

I have noted a number of cases of *gnī* as dual of *agnī* and its compounds. The commentator gives two *antarāgnī paṣāṇām* (i 6 7¹), and *viṣvāmītrajamadagnī vasīshthena* (iii 1 7³ and v 4 11³).

न हिपरः ॥ ३७ ॥

37 But not when followed by *hi*

The case excepted is that of *gnī* occurring as nominative singular feminine of *āndrāgna* *āndragñī hi bārhaspatyā* (v 5 6²). The commentator pleads the occurrence of *indragñī havāmahe* "in another text," as justification of the rule, in saying "by *hi*," instead of "by *h*." But we may question whether the justification is not officious and uncalled for.

वीङ्द्वारौकृष्णाश्चरावोयदापरः ॥ ३८ ॥

35 *patī ity asya yatra yatra gruti*¹ *gravanam asti tatra tatra pragrahatvaṁ vyūṇeyam yathā dvāu----* *subh----* *grutir itī kim yam----* *priy----* *ity ādāv api*² *padāṅkadeṣe pragrahatvāya*³

¹ G M om ² G M om ³ G M *tvam*

36 *gnī itī pragraho bhavati*¹ *yathā*² *ant----* *viṣv----*

¹ G M om ² G M om

37 *gnī itī sāmnaḍhyāḥ labhyate na khalu gnī itī*¹ *padānto hi parah pragraho bhavati*² *yathā āndr----* *evampara itī kim indr----* *itī cākhāntare*

¹ G M ins *api* ² G M om

38 Also an *i* or *e* followed by *vid*, *dvārāu*, *krṣṇnah*, *carāvah*, and *yadā*

The quoted passages under this rule have each its counter-example. The first is *dhūshane vidū satī vidayethām* (141²), a double case, and, to show that *vī* alone would not have been enough, *āpaṣ ca me vīrudhaṣ ca me* (1v75¹). Next, *devī dvārāu mā mā* (1124⁴), with *dvādaṣa sam padhyante dvādaṣa* (157³), to prove the need of the *rāu* of *dvārāu*. Again, *yajñāyā 'tishthamāne krṣṇno rūpam kṛtvā* (113¹ only G M have the first word, they also omit the last two words, while B O omit *kṛtvā*), and *cātvalē krṣṇavishāṇām prā 'syati* (113³ G M omit the last two words) justifies the *h* of *krṣṇnah*. Again, *vivasānāu ye carāvah* (1510¹), with *rāye ca nah svapatyāya deva* (v54⁴ G M omit *deva*) to show that *ca* alone would not have been enough to prove that more than *car* or *carā* is needed, the commentator does not attempt. Finally, we have *ajanan nannamāne yadē 'dam tāh* (1v62⁴ only G M have *ajanan*). To this is raised the question whether *yatante*, as coming before *yad ā* in *grenṣo yatante yad ākshushur divyam* (1v67⁴ only G M have the first word), is not also *pragraha*⁹. The answer is an appeal to rule 150, "in citations of *padas*, a *pada* only is to be understood" but how we are to know that an integral *pada* is meant to be signified by *yadā*, any more than by *vidā*, the commentator does not inform us

न ज्ञे ज्ञे नित्यम् ॥३९॥

39 But not *jñe* and *ahne*, under any circumstances

The passages quoted in illustration of the rule are *varunāya rājñe krṣṇnah* (v511), and *vanaspatīnām enyahne krṣṇnah* (v515 only G M have the first word) these are both exceptions to the preceding rule, and are the immediate occasion of the

38 ----- 'ity evampara¹ ikāra ekāro vā² pragraho bhavati³ yathā⁴ dhīsh----- dakārena⁵ kim āpaṣ----- devī----- rāu iti kim dvād----- yaj----- visargena kim cāt----- viv----- rāva iti kim rāye----- aj----- nanu⁶.ṣi e----- ity atra pragrahatvam kim na syāt padagrahaneshu padam gamayeta (150) iti⁷ vacanān na bhavati⁸ 'ti brūmah

¹ G M eshu pareshu ² G M ins padāntah ³ G M om ⁴ W G M om ⁵ G M vid it ⁶ G M om ⁷ G M atra ⁸ W pravartate, G M om

39 *jñe ahne ity¹ etayor antyasvaro nityam pragraho na syāt yathā var----- van----- vīdādi* (1v38) *prāptir anayoḥ nityaṣabdah prāptyantarapratibandhakah² yathā³ yaj----- gamayatobhavadatah* (1v52) *ity ādinā prāptih sva----- somāyasva* (1v48) *iti prāptih*

¹ G M om ² B O pratishedh-, G M prāptyānishedhāprayajanakah ³ G M om

introduction here of this one But the addition of *ntyam*, 'constantly, in all cases,' excepts the same words from the action of any other rule for example, of rules 52 and 48, which would otherwise apply in the passages *yagñe 'pi kartor iti tāv abratām* (iv 6 7¹) and *svarāyñe novādhau* (v 6 21)

आकारैकारपूर्वस्तु बहुस्वरस्य ते थे ॥४०॥

40 *Te* and *the*, however, are *pragraha* in a word of more than two syllables, if preceded by *ā* or *e*

The class of words here aimed at, of course, is composed of second and third persons plural of present and perfect tenses middle of verbs The commentator quotes several instances *etasmun vā etāu mrjāte yo vidvishānayoh* (ii 2 6^{1 2} only G M have the first three words, and they omit the last word), *śukrā manthindāu grhyete* (vi 4 10¹), *pra prthivyā riricāthe divaṣ ca* (iv 2 11¹ only G M have the first and the last two words), and *drñhanā yam nudethe* (iv 7 15²) Then, to justify the requirement of a preceding *ā* or *e*, we have given us *ā vrgyate vā etad yagamānah* (iii 3 8¹ G M omit the last word), of a polysyllabic word, *tat pravāte vi shaganti* (vi 4 7² see under 1 48) and *yad ete grhyante* (iii 3 6¹), the restriction to the endings *te* and *the*, *anūcyamāna ā sādāyati* (ii 2 5⁷, 11¹)

As to the special significance of *tu*, 'however,' in this rule, two of our commentator's three chief authorities, Vararuci and Māhishaya, are reported by him as at variance The former maintains that it indicates the cessation of regard had to the words specified in rule 38 as occasions of *pragraha*-quality, the latter, that it prescribes the annulment of continued implication of the exceptions mentioned in rule 39, and of what was there signified by the word *ntyam* Vararuci's view is declared the better one, and with good reason—unless, indeed, we prefer to ascribe to the word a general change of subject, from mention of individual words to the description of a class

40 *bahusvarasya padasya sambandhī te iti the iti vā* ² "kārapūva ekdrāpūro vā pragraho bhavati yathā et---- *śukr----- pra----- drñh----- evampūva iti kim ā vrg----- trini----- bahusvarasye 'ti kim tat---- yad----- tethe iti kim anūc----- vīdādī* (iv 38) *namittasāpekshatānvartakas tu ṣabdu iti vararucipakshah māhishayapakshas tu vakshyate* ³ *pūvasūtroktanishedhanūtyaṣabdayāpūtanuvrttim* ⁴ *nivārayati* ⁵ *'ti* ⁶ *tatra* ⁷ *vararucimatam ruciram bahavaḥ svarā yasmin tad bahusvaram tasya atra svaraṣabdopādānāc* ⁸ *ca* ⁹ *bahuṣabdena vyaktibhedo vyūṇeyah*

¹ W -*dhya* ² G M ms *ṣabdhah* ³ G M *ucyate* ⁴ G M -*dham* *nt* ⁵ G M *var* ⁶ G M om ⁷ G M *atra* ⁸ W *bahusvaraṣabdopādānatā*, B O *bahu svararupaṣabdena upadānatā* ⁹ W B O om

The commentator's final remark as to *bahusvarasya* is obscure to me

न शार्यति ॥ ४१ ॥

41 But not *śāryāte*

Namely, in the passage *śāryāte apibah sutasya* (i 4 18 G M omit the last word) An exception to the preceding rule, by express mention of the excepted word

ते मापातंनमश्नमभिवायुर्गर्भमुपाहस्तुपरः ॥ ४२ ॥

42 *Te* is *pragraha* when followed by *mā pātām*, *namah*, *enam abhi*, *vāyuh*, *garbham*, *upa*, *ahas*, and *tu*

The passages, as quoted by the commentator, are *vām ā rahhe te mā pātām ā'sya* (i 2 2^{1 2} only G M have the first three words), with *te mā'smin yajñe* (iii 2 4¹), to show the necessity of including *pātām* in the rule, *punas te namo'gnaye 'pratividdhāya* (i 5 10¹ only G M have the last word), with *te na vy ajayanta* (v 4 1¹), to prove that *na* alone would not have been enough, *te enam abhi sum anahyetām* (ii 5 6⁵), with *ta enam bhishajyanti brahmanah* (ii 3 11⁴ W omits the last word), to justify the inclusion of *abhi*, *te vāyur vy avāt* (iii 4 3¹), with *te vācaṁ striyam* (vi 1 6⁵), to show why the *yuk* of *vāyuh* was needed, *te garbham adad'itām* (iii 4 3¹), without any counter-example to prove that *ga* would not have answered the purpose, *te upā'mantrayanta* (vi 1 3¹), *te ahorātrayoh* (vi 1 3¹), *te tv āva no'tsrye ity āhuh* (vii 5 7¹ G M omit the last two words), with *te te dhāmāny uḡmasi* (i 3 6¹), to show that *i* not followed by *u* is not enough to determine the *pragraha*-quality Then, as further counter-examples, we have *te devāḥ* (i 4 10¹ et al) in proof that *te* is not *pragraha* before other words than those here mentioned, and *brhad ukshe namah* (i 4 26), *amushmin loka upa cere* (v 3 7²), and *yanti*

41 *śāryāta ity antyasvarah¹ pragraho na² bhavati yathā śār----- pārvasātraprāptāu³ satyām kanthoktanishedho⁴ 'nena⁵ vidhīyate*

¹ B *yah s-* ² O om ³ G M *-tena pr*, B *tre pr-* ⁴ G M *-ktyā n* ⁵ G M om

42 ¹----- *evamparas te iti śabdah pragrahah syāt yathā² vām----- pātām iti kum te----- punas----- ma iti kum te----- te e----- abhi 'ti kum ta----- te v----- yur iti kum te v----- te ga----- te u----- te ah----- te tv----- ukā-rena kum te te----- evampara iti kum te d----- te iti kum brh----- am----- yanti-----*

¹ W B O ms *te* ² G M om

vā ete savanādye 'hah (vii 5 6^a), showing that only *te* is *pragraha* in the situations defined

These are not all the instances found in the Sanhitā of *te* as *pragraha*, one was disposed of by rule 20 above, and at least one or two others come under the action of other rules of this chapter

अनुदात्तो न नित्यम् ॥ ४३ ॥

43 But not when unaccented, under any circumstances

That is to say, even in such a situation as would bring it otherwise under the preceding rule. The example quoted is *bāhu-bhīdām uta te namah* (iv 5 1¹) if the text contains others I have failed to notice them. The specification *nityam* has its usual force, as suspending the application of all rules to the contrary, wherever found for example, that of rule 52, below, in the passage *namas te astv āyudhāya* (iv 5 1²)

एते तनुवौवैसमेवह्रियज्ञपदिष्टकपरः ॥ ४४ ॥

44 *Ete* is *pragraha* when followed by *tanuvāu vāi sam, eva, hi, yajña, pad,* and *ishtak*

The passages, as quoted by the commentator, are *tasyāi 'te tanuvāu* (v 7 3³), *ete vāi svarātsam asya cakshushī* (ii 5 6¹ G M omit the last word), with *ete vā idāyāi stanāh* (i 7 1² G M omit the last word) as counter-example, showing that before *vāi* not followed by *sam* the word is not *pragraha*, *sa ete eva namasyann upā 'dhavat* (ii 5 6⁵ only G M have the first word, and they omit the last two), *ete hi dvānām* (ii 5 6⁶ another case at vi 5 7¹), *cakshushī vā ete yajñasya* (ii 6 2¹ et al compare also the nearly identical passage vi 2 11³), *yajñasya hy ete pūde atha* (v 1 6^{3 4} W omits the first word), and *yad ete ishtake upadādhātī* (v 3 5²). Counter-examples would have been in place to show that, in citing the last three fragments of words, the rule had taken no more than just what was sufficient for its purpose, but

43 *mā pāṭam ityādīparō 'pi te ity antyasaro*¹ *'nūdātto nityam pragraho na bhavati yathā*² *bāh----- nityam iti kim lakshandantaraprāptasyā 'pi pratishedho*³ *yathā syāt na----- gamayatobhavatah* (iv 52) *ity ādinā*⁴ *prāptih*

¹ O -yah sv ² G M om ³ G M nish ⁴ O G M om, B antya

44 ¹----- *ity evampara ete ity antyasvanah*² *padāntah*³ *pragraho bhavati yathā tas---* *ete----- sam iti kim ete---* *sa----- ete----- cak----- yaj----- yad-----* ⁴*evampara iti kim atha----- ete iti kim man----- push----- agre----- sapt-----*⁴

¹ B O ins *ete* ² O -yah s ³ G M om ⁴ W B O om

they are not furnished. The general counter-examples under this rule, like those under the last but one, proving that only *ete* is *pragraha* before the words specified, and *ete* itself before them only, are given by G M, but omitted in the other manuscripts: they are *atha kutama ete devā itī* (11 6 9³), *manuta evā 'nam etāni* (v 5 6¹), *pushkaraparne hy enam upagṛitam* (v 1 4⁴ MSS -*gru-tam*), *agre yaṇāpatim dhatta* (11 5¹), and *saptame pade juhote* (v 1 8¹)

परश्च द्वयोः ॥ ४५ ॥

45 As also, the letter following the two last mentioned

The "two" of the rule are *pad* and *ishtak*, and the commentator makes the further obvious specification that the letter following them is *pragraha* only when they themselves follow *ete*, as prescribed in the preceding rule. He quotes the passages referred to *yaṇāsya hy ete pade atho* (v 1 6^{3 4} W omits to *pade*, B O to *ete*), and *yaḍ ete ishake upadadhāti* (v 3 5²), adding, to show the necessity of the limitation made by him, the counter-examples *saptame pade juhote* (v 1 8¹), and *tasyās te devā 'shtake* (1V 2 9²)

स्यःपरः ॥ ४६ ॥

46 Also one followed by *sthaḥ*

There is a natural reason for this rule, *sthaḥ* being a dual verb, and so, apt to be preceded by a dual noun. I have noted near a dozen cases in the text, the one cited in illustration by the commentator is *viśnoḥ gnyaptre sthaḥ* (12 13³). To show that *stha* instead of *sthaḥ* would not answer, is given *etasmīn loke stha yu-shmāñs te 'nu* (11.2 5⁶ only G M have the first two words, and they omit the last three)

परश्चोभयोः ॥ ४७ ॥

47 As also, one following them both

Following, namely, a *sthaḥ* and a preceding *pragraha* word for example, *gilpe sthas te vam ārabhe* (12 2¹ but this citation is wanting in G M), and *drahe sthaḥ githare samīcī* (111 2 4³). A counter-example, of a word following *sthaḥ* only, is *vrshandū stha urvacī* (1 3 7¹)

45 *numittina upari vartamānayoh padishtakṣabdayoh para² ikāra ekāro vā pragraho bhavati yathā yaḥ---- yaḍ---- numittina upari vartamānayor itī kim sapt---- tas----*

¹ B O *dvayoh padishtak ity etayoh cakān ānvādishtayoh*, G M *pat ishaka ity etayoh cakān ānvādishtayoh dvayoh* ² B O *parata* ³ G M *om*

46 *stha ity evampara ikāra ekāro vā padāntah pragraho bhavati yathā viśh---- visargena kim et----*

The commentator then proceeds to point out that the difference in phraseology between this rule and the last but one—*dr̥vayoh*, 'two,' being used in the one, and *ubhayoh*, 'both,' in the other—indicates a difference of meaning. Above, the two affecting causes (*nimitta*) specified in the preceding rule, each along with the word affected by it (*nimittin*), were intended, here, on the other hand, the two aimed at are an affecting and an affected word.

सोमायस्वैतस्मिन् ॥ ४८ ॥

48 Also in the section beginning *somāya sva*

The section in question is v 6 21 it was necessary to add *sva*, in order to distinguish it from that beginning *somāya pitrmate* (1 8 5). It contains thirteen *pragrahas*, of which the commentator cites several together *avi dve dhenā bhāumī* (v 6 21¹ G M omit *bhāumī*) three of these, however, would be disposed of by the three rules next following

द्वे ॥ ४९ ॥

49 Also *dve*

This word, which occurs about forty times in the Tāttiriya text, is, of course, always *pragraha*. The commentator cites two instances *dvedve sum bharati* (1 6 8²), and *yad dve naçyetaṁ* (11 6 3³)

परश्च ॥ ५० ॥

47 *cakārānvādāṣṭayoh pūrvasūtroktanimittanimittinor¹ ubhayoh para ikāra ekāro vā padāntah pragraho bhavati yathā ṣaḥ----- dr̥dhe----- ubhayor iti kim vr̥sh----- paraṣ ca dvayor* (1v 45) *iti² vācya ubhayor iti ṣabdāntaram³ arthāntara-jñāpakam⁴ nimittisahitayoh⁵ pūrvasūtroktayor nimittayoh parah pragraho bhavati paraṣ ca dvayor* (1v 45) *iti sūtrāntah atra tu⁶ sūtre nimittanimittinor⁷ ubhayoh parah pragrahah syād iti viśeṣhād⁸ bhedo vyñeayah⁹*

¹ G M *purvokta* ² B ins *kim ca*, O ins *ca* ³ G M *-taraprayogah* ⁴ G M *kah* ⁵ G M *-itas-* ⁶ G M om ⁷ G M *tinimittayoh* ⁸ B *-shana*, O *-shena*, G M *vishaya* ⁹ G M *drashtavyah*

48 *somāya svarājñe¹* (v 6 21) *ity asmann anuvāka ikāra ekāro vā padāntah pragraho bhavati yathā avi----- ity ādi sve² iti kim somāya pitrmate* (1 8 5) *ity atra mā bhād iti*

49 *dve ity antyasvarah padāntah¹ sarvatra pragraho bhavati yathā² dve----- yad-----*

¹ G M om ² G M om ³ G M O om

50 As also, the following word.

The comment instances but one case, a double one *dve gukṛte dve kṛshne mārḍhanvatih* (v 3 1⁴ G M omit the last word) Of such the text contains more than a dozen, but they are not worth referring to in detail

एकव्यवेतो ऽपि ॥ ५१ ॥

51 Likewise the next but one

The *api*, 'likewise,' in this rule is explained as bringing forward *dve* from the last rule but one, another application of the "principle of the frog's leap" The cited examples are *dve hy ete devate* (ii 1 9³ but G M omit this citation), and *dve vāva devasatre* (vii 4 5¹) By rule 1 48, *devasatre*, though a divisible compound (*pada*-text, *devasatre itī deva-satre*), is reckoned as but a single *pada* for the purposes of this precept another like case, *dve su-vane gukṛavati* (vi 1 6⁴), was expressly quoted as an illustration under the former rule At vi 6 4³ (*dve jāye vindate*) is a case where the action of the rule is suspended by a later one, iv 54

गमयतोभवतोऽनूकारात्परंतनूयदकरोत्कुर्यादिष्टिष्वब्रू-
तांप्रवर्तास्तास्तन्मीतांवाचयतिबिभृतस्ताग्निंगायत्रंताभ्या-
मेवोभाभ्यामवान्तरं पर आ षष्ठात् ॥ ५२ ॥

52 Before, and within six words of, *gamayatah*, *bhavatah* (except when it follows *ū*), *tanū yat*, *akarot*, *kuryāt* (in *ishṭi* passages), *abrūtām*, *pra varta*, *āstām*, *stabhnātām*, *vācayati*, *bibhrītas ta*, *agnim gāyatram*, *tābhyaṁ eva*, *ubhābhyaṁ*, and *avāntaram*

Of the words here specified, some are duals, and so would naturally have other duals, with *pragraha* endings, in their vicinity, in other cases, the collocation is purely accidental

The *ā* in the rule is declared to be intended this time "inclusively" (*tena saha*, 'along with the specified limit' compare the scholast to Pāṇini ii 1 13), and the necessity of the specification

50 *ekādro dve ity anvādīṣati dve ity etasmāt para ikāra ekādro vā padāntah pragraho bhavati² yathā³ dve----*

¹ O *asmāt* ² B O *syāt*, G M om ³ G M om

51 *ekavyaveto¹ 'pi dve ity etasmāt para ikāra ekādro vā padāntah pragraho bhavati² yathā³ dve---- dve---- ekena padena⁴ vyaveta⁵ ekavyavetah aṇṣabdo dve ity anvādīṣati man-dākaplutyāyena*

• ¹ B O *vahito* ² G M om ³ G M om ⁴ G M om ⁵ W *vyavahata*

"within six words" is explained as arising from rule 130, which would limit the meaning of "before" to 'the word standing next before' This involves a misinterpretation of the rule referred to, which was made for quite another purpose (see the note upon it) No such special and technical ground is needed to justify the terms of the present rule, which are of obvious and incontestable propriety

The commentator's example for *gamāyatah* is *te evāṇ 'nam pra-tishthām gamāyatah* (ii 1 4⁷) I have noted no other case For *bhavatah*, he gives *uttarāvati bhavatah* (v 4 8⁵), with the counter-example *dikshante 'ntanāmānāv rta bhavatah* (vii 4 8¹), to show the necessity of the restriction imposed by the rule in the case of this word There are quite a number of other passages where *bhavatah* assures the *pragraha*-quality to words in its neighborhood I have noted ii 2 2³, 11 4⁵, 3 2³, 3⁵, 4³, 4⁸, 11 1 7², 9³, 5 4⁴, v 4 6³, 5 1² vii 1 4³, 2 1³ twice With regard to the limitation *anākārāt*, the commentator remarks that although simple absence is the primary significance of its negative prefix, yet another meaning is here assumed, in accordance with the requirements of the case that is to say, "after a not-*a*" is to be understood as 'after any letter but *a*' For *tanū yat*, we have *ete vā mahāyajñasyā 'niye tanū yat* (ii 2 7⁵ I have found no other case), and, as counter-example, to justify the inclusion of *yat*, *paripataye tvā grhṇāmi tanūnaptre tvā* (i 2 10² only W has the last word) For *akarot*, *budhnavati agramavati yāgyānuvākye akarot* (ii 3 4³ another case at ii 2 8⁵) For *kuryāt*, *mānavi rcau dhāyye kuryāt* (ii 2 10² another case at ii 3 3⁵), with the counter-example *agnaye dāte purodācam ashtākapālam kuryāt* (ii 5 5²), to explain the restriction to *isht*-passages The *ishtis* are defined as being "the three *pragṇas* beginning with the tenth, but excepting their final *anuvākas*" (which have before received the designation *yāgyā*) that is to say, ii 2 1-11, 3 1-13, 4 1-13 There are other passages besides the one quoted proving the necessity of the restriction in question thus v 4 7⁷ vii 5 5¹ For *abrūtām* is cited *te abrūtām varam vrnāvahā* (ii 5 2⁵, 6⁵ another case at v 2 3³) For *pravarta*, *havirādhane praci pravartayeyuh* (iii 1 3¹), with the counter-

52 *gamāyatah bhavato 'nākārāt ākāravyatirikta-varnāt param bhavata iti* ¹ *yady apy abhāvo mukhyārthas tathā 'pi tad-
anyāthatā² svikrta³ lakshyānusārāt tanū yat akarot kuryād
ishtishu ishtayo ⁴ dāgamādayas trayah pragṇā uttamānuvāka-
vartitā⁵ abrūtām ----- ity evampara ā shashthāt padāt pārvo
vartamāna ikāru ekdro vā pudāntah pragraho bhavati⁶ abhiv-
dhāv ayam ākārah tena sahe 'ty abhivdhih yathā te----
utt---- anākārāt paṇam iti kim diksh---- ete---- yad iti
kim pari---- budh---- mān---- ishtishv iti kim agn-
---- te---- hav---- varte 'ti kim te---- ime---- vāg-
---- utt---- te---- te' 'ti kim manm---- ete---- gāya-*

example *te 'dityāñ sam adhrūyanta tvayā pra jāndāme 'ta* (vi 1 5¹ G M end at *pra*), to show why *varta* was added to *pra* For *āstām, ime vāi sahā 'stām* (iii 4 3¹ another case at iv 3 10²) For *stabhnūtām, vācgvadevāgnimārute ukthe avyathayanti stabhnūtām* (iv 4 2³) For *vācayati, uttame dudumbari vācayati* (v 1 10^{2 3}) For *bibhras ta, te eva yajamānasya reto bibhras tasmāt* (v 6 8⁴), with the counter-example *manmahe yāv ātmanvad bibhrto yāu* (iv 7 15³), to show that *bibhrta* alone would not have answered the purpose of the rule Doubtless the single case is provided for in this rule rather than in 42, above, because there are cases of *ta eva* in the Sanhitā which it would have made trouble to distinguish properly from this one For *agnim gāyatram, ete dadhāte ye agnim gāyatram* (vi 3 5³), with the counter-example *sadhashte gnum purishyam* (iv 1 3¹), to show that the addition of *gāyatram* was needful For *tābhyām eva, ete vāi yajñasyā 'īyasāyanī srutī tābhyām eva* (vii 2 1², 3 5³, 7³, 9³, 4 1³, 2⁴, 4³) With reference to this passage, the commentator raises the difficulty that *ete*, one of the words intended to be determined as *pragraha*, is not within six words of *eva*, one of the two words specified in the rule as conditioning its *pragraha*-character within that distance, but he declares it of no account, since what is within reach of any part of the assigned cause (*nimitta*) is within reach of that cause in its entirety For, he says, in common life also, a quality belonging to a part is ascribed to the whole which contains that part for example, people say "Devadatta has an ear-ring," when it is really his ear that has the ring Truly a most lucid and convincing illustration! The necessity of the *eva* is proved by the counter-example *apa hañsy agne tābhyām, putena* (iv 7 13¹ G M omit the last word) For *ubhābhyām, ye dve ahoi ātre eva te ubhābhyām* (vii 4 4⁴) Finally, for *avāntaram, utsrye ity āhur ye avāntaram* (vii 5 7¹), with the counter-example *sam te 'va te hedah* (ii 5 12¹), to prove that *ava* would not have been enough alone

न ग्रामीवर्चसीमिथुनीमासेल्लोकेधत्ते ॥ ५३ ॥

53 But not *grāmī, varcasī, mithunī, māse, loke, dhatte*

tram iti kim sadh----- ete----- atra padadvayam ekam⁸ nimittam ity⁹ etepadam¹⁰ uddīcya¹¹ "shashthanvayamabhaṅgaprasaṅga iti cet¹² 'yam bhaṅgaprasaṅga¹³ nimittādikadeśasya shashthatvopapattih sakalasya¹⁴ 'pi nimittasya¹⁵ shashthatvam upapadyate loke¹⁶ 'py avayavadharmenā¹⁷ 'vayavino¹⁸ 'pi¹⁹ vṛkṣhasiddheh tathā hi karṇe kundalam dhārayantān kundalī devadatta iti vadanti eve²⁰ 'ti kim apa----- ye----- ut----- antarām iti kim sam----- ā shashthād iti kim para ity uttarah (130) iti paribhāṣhayā²¹ 'nantarasya²² 'va paratvam syāt tan mā bhūd iti

¹ G M ins *padam* nañō ² G M *tām* ³ G M *kārya* ⁴ G M ins *nāma*
⁵ G M -*karahitah* ⁶ G M om ⁷ W B O *ste* ⁸ G M *etan* ⁹ O *eve* 'ty
¹⁰ O *etat* p- ⁽¹¹⁾ B O *mā* 'vam *pras-* G M om *bhanna* ¹² W O *sa* 'm

These are words which, occurring within six of those mentioned in the last rule, would be *pragraha* if not thus specially excepted. The commentator quotes the passages in which they occur, as follows *grāmy eva bhavati ganavati yājñānvrākye bhavatah* (II 3 3⁵ another nearly identical case is found at II 2 11⁴), *brahmavarcasy eva bhavaty ubhayato rukmāu bhavatah* (II 3 2³), *atha mūhantā bhavatah* (VI 5 8⁶), *pāṇināṁse prā yuchāt tāv ubiātām* (II 5 2³), *loke pratitishthanto yanti dvāu shadāhāu bhavatah* (VII 4 11³), and *dhatte jyotishmantāv asmā imāu lokāu bhavatah* (II 6 2⁴).

अते समानपदे नित्यमवे चावे च ॥५४॥

54 Nor *ate*, in a single word, nor *ave*, under any circumstances

After paraphrasing the rule, in a way which shows that he regards the specifications "in a single word" and "under any circumstances" as both alike referring to each of the "parts of words" mentioned, the commentator proceeds to cite illustrative passages, as follows *ava rundhate tvātiāv ubhato bhavatah* (VII 2 6³, 4 1³, 2⁵, 3⁶ another nearly identical case is found at VII 4 5⁴), *abhyāhvayate vajram enam abhi prā vanto yati* (III 2 9^{1 7}), and *andātāya dhr̥shnave ubhābhyām uta te namaḥ* (IV 5 1⁴ B O omit the last word, and G M the last two). To show the necessity of specifying that *ate* should form part of a single word, he quotes *eva te ubhābhyām* (VII 4 4³). The limitation *ntyam*, 'under any circumstances,' is explained in the usual manner, as intended to exclude the operation of other rules besides the one (IV 52) here especially aimed at for the appropriate examples we are referred to the comment upon rule 159, where they are given in connection with the illustration of another point

53 ----- *eteshv¹ antyasvaro gamayato bhavata ityādīpāro 'pi pragraho na bhavati yathā². grā ---- brah----- atha---- pār----- loke----- dhatte----*

¹ G M *eshv* ² G M *om*

54 *nishedham cakāro 'nvādisūti ate ave ity ananyoh padān kadecayor antyasvarah samānapade vartamāno gamayato bhavata ityādīpāro 'pi nityam pragraho na bhavati yathā¹ ava ---- abhy---- and----- samānapada uti kim eva---- atra nityaṣabdhah prāptyanantarapāṇān ūthah udāharanam² upabandhus tu decāya (159) uti sūtre³ prasūṅgād uktān samānām ca tat padam ca samānapadam tasmint samānapade⁴*

*uti tribhāṣhyatne prātiṣākyavivarane
caturtho 'dhyāyah*

¹ O *om* ² G M *ut soda* ³ W *sutrena* ⁴ G M *om*.

This finishes the rehearsal of the words with *pragraha*-endings contained in the *Sanhitā*. As to the economy of the method of their rehearsal—whether it would have been possible to state the facts in fewer or briefer rules—I cannot speak with confidence it would be, certainly, a thankless task to endeavor to recast them in an improved form. Nor can I, without a *pada*-manuscript, or a much more thorough and detailed study of the text, with the aid of a commentary, than it has been in my power to make, judge absolutely the success of the method followed. It appears, however (with exception of the equivocal treatment of the words in *o*, pointed out under rule 7), to be complete. My exception of the text has shown me no *pragraha*-endings in *i* and *e* which are not duly taken account of, nor any case of final *i* or *e* not *pragraha* as involved in the general rules of the chapter without being duly excepted by special precept. One or two words whose endings are treated as uncombinable without being *pragraha* are disposed of in another chapter (x 18).

CHAPTER V

CONTENTS 1-2, introductory, relation of *pada* and *samhitā* texts, 3, order of application of rules, 4-8, anomalous insertions of a sibilant and *d*, 9-10, anomalous conversions of *r* and *h*, 11-19, anomalous omissions of *v*, *s*, *h*, *m*, and *y*, 20-24, treatment of final *n* and *t* before palatal letters, 25-26, before *l*, 27-31, of final *m* before a consonant, 32-33, of final *n*, *t*, *n* before sibilants, 34-37, of initial *ç* after consonants, 38-41, of initial *h* after consonants

अथ संहितायामेकप्राणभावे ॥ १ ॥

1 The following rules apply in combined text (*samhitā*), within the compass of a single breath

This is an introductory heading to the main part of the *Prātiśākhya*—the rules for the construction of the euphonicly combined text (*samhitā*) from its presupposed material, the *pada*-text, where

1 *athe 'ty ayam adhikārah samhitāyām ekapīṇabhāva ity etad adhikṛtam vedatavyam ita uttaram yad vakshyāmah samhite 'ti ko 'rthah nānāpadasamdhānasamyogah'* (xxiv 3) *iti 'sūtreṇo 'ktāḥ samhitārthah' parah samnikarṣah samhite 'ti vāyākarandh' pathanti' ekasamutthah prāṇa ekapīṇah tasya bhāvas tadbhāvaḥ' tasmīn ity ātreya-matam anyathā 'pi sannāsaḥ saṃgachate ekapīṇena bhāvyaḥ janyata uccāryata ity ekapīṇabhāvaḥ ekeno 'chvāseṇa yāvān uccāryate vedabhāgas tāvān ekapīṇabhāva ity arthah ata evā 'vāsāne padavi-*

each word stands separate, as if occurring independently. It is a rule of far-reaching force, applying through many chapters (for an attempt to define precisely how far, see the comment to xxiv 2). The matters treated in the first two chapters—the mode of utterance of elementary sounds, definitions, general explanatory precepts, and the like—were with propriety first disposed of, the separate rehearsal of the *pragraha* endings, made in chapter iv, is more questionable, but defensible on the ground that those endings exhibit their *pragraha* character also in the *pada*-text, before *iti* but the exclusion of the vowels irregularly protracted in *samhitā*, as rehearsed in the third chapter, is quite anomalous (see note to iii 1).

The commentator defines *samhitā* by quoting a later rule (xxiv 3), which declares it to be “the union of separate words in euphonic combination,” referring at the same time to the rule of Pāṇini (1.4.109), as the account of it given by “the grammarians.” For *ekapānabhāve* he first gives us Ātreya’s simple paraphrase, but then goes on to explain it more fully, as ‘that which is brought about, generated, uttered, with a single breath, such portion of the Veda, namely, as is uttered by the help of one expiration’—the condition of *pada*, or separated and euphonic independent words, recurring with the pause that follows the expiration. That is to say, if the repeater of the text has to pause to take breath where there is no regular *avasāna*, or pause of inter-punctuation (such as separates the *pādas* of a verse: its length is taught in rule xxi 13), his last word is thrown out of *sandhi* with the next, and the end of the one and the beginning of the other must assume their *pada* form.

Now is interposed an objection: of what use are the two specifications “in combined text” and “within the compass of a single breath?” the former is enough by itself. To this it is replied: if the latter specification were not made, then no pause after a *pada* would be authorized in the continuous *samhitā* arrangement and if the other were not made, then that respecting the single breath would apply also to the *pādas*, hence doubt would arise as to where any diuision to be given would have force: there is, therefore, good reason for the double specification.

*dlīh nanu samhitāyām ity etāvatārī 'vā' 'lam ekapānabhāva
iti vā ubhayārambhanena⁵ kim ucyate⁶ ekapānabhāva ity an-
rābhyamāne pravṛttasya samhitāvidheḥ paddvasānutvam ne 'sh-
yate samhitāyām ity anrābhyamāne tu padeshv apy ekapāna-
bhāva upapadyata iti¹⁰ vakshyamānam¹¹ kāryam kva¹² bhavati
'ti samdehaḥ syāt tasmād¹³ asminn¹⁴ ubhayārambhane¹⁵ prayo-
janam asti*

¹ B O *-nayoga* ² G M *sūtrokta* ³ G M *samhate 'ty ar-* ⁴ W B G
vānyā- ⁵ G M *bhananti* ⁶ W om ⁷ B O om *eva* ⁸ B O *bhena*, G M
-bhane ⁹ G M om ¹⁰ G M om ¹¹ B G M *na* ¹² B O G M *kutra vā*
¹³ G M *tadā* ¹⁴ G M *tas-* ¹⁵ O G M *-bhe*, W B. *-bhena*

यथायुक्ताद्विधिः सा प्रकृतिः ॥ २ ॥

2 Separation from the text as combined—that is the fundamental text

I cannot but believe the intent of this precept to be the same with that of the rule which begins the second chapter of the Rik Pr., *samhitā padaprakṛtiḥ*, 'the *pada*-text is the foundation of the *samhitā*' but such intent is not readily and distinctly deducible either from the rule itself or from its commentary. The latter explains that hereby is taught the *prakṛti*, or proper form, of *samhitā*, the reason being that a later rule (xxiv 5) prescribes as necessary to be understood, among other things, "*prakṛti, vikrama, krama*" An arrangement which does not deviate from the *pada*-text as constituted, taken as supreme, that is to be regarded as the fundamental text. By way of illustration is then quoted the whole series of passages falling under the action of rule x 13, below, passages in which the fundamental or *pada* form of certain words is maintained, against the ordinary rules of euphonic combination they are *svadhā asy uvī cā'si* (i 1 9³), *dhanvann va prapā asī* (ii 5 12⁴), *sahasī asya pramā asī* (iv 4 11⁵). G M put this citation before the preceding one), *pīa budhnyā īrate* (iv 3 13⁶), *jyā vyūṣṣamane* (iv 6 6²), *ā pāshā etu* (ii 4 5¹ W B O omit this), and *aminantu evāhi* (iii 1 11⁵). No explanation is attempted of the bearing of these examples upon the principle which is laid down in the rule now in hand—we may suppose it to be that, the application of the rules of *sandhi* being denied in the case of these particular words, they remain in *samhitā* in their regular or natural shape as shown in *pada*-text—*prakṛtyā*, as it is elsewhere termed. And in this office of the precept is to be seen the real ground of its statement, rather than in a provision against the requirements of xxiv 5.

The grand difficulty in this exposition lies in its quiet postulation of *avicalitah*, 'unremoved, not deviating,' as connective between *vidhiḥ* and *yathāyuktāt*. I would sooner recur to the etymologic meaning of *vidhi*, 'disposal, putting apart,' and empha-

2 *prakṛtiḥ samhitāsvārūpam aneno 'cyate prakṛtir vikramah kramah* (xxiv 5) *iti vyñheyatvavidhānāt' yathāyuktād yathāsthitāt' padapāthāt kṛtasthād avicalito³ yo vidhiḥ sa prakṛti-samhitā⁴ vyñheyā vidhiḥ vidhānam prakṛtir ity arthah yathā⁵ svā-... dhan-... sah-... pra-... jyā-... ā pū-... amr-... atra sūtre padānām parasparāvayō mahābhāshyavācandē⁶ cā' vyñheyah tuc ca vacanam tā varnaprakṛtayah* (ii 7) *ity atra pathanti⁷ evam atra⁸ 'pi svaritayor madhye yatra nīcam* (xix 1) *ity āddu mantavyam*

¹ W *vyñheyatvavidhāt*, B *-hena vi-*, G M *jñeyatvena vi-* ² G M *-thāvas*
³ G M *cāline* ⁴ W B O *-tiḥ s* ⁵ G M *om* ⁶ G M *canena* ⁷ G M *om*
⁸ O G M *pathitam* ⁹ G M *anyatrā*

size its prefix *vi* sufficiently to make it take an ablative adjunct, meaning 'separation from [the state] as combined,' and I have so translated above, though far from being confident that I have found the true solution of the difficulty. Neither *vidhi* nor its synonym *vidhāna* occurs elsewhere in the text, although both are frequent in the commentary (see Index), usually with the meaning 'rule, prescription,' not infrequently also 'arrangement, disposal.'

The commentator concerns himself finally with the gender of *sā*, which, he says, comes under the rule already once quoted from the Mahabhāshya in explanation of a like case (under ii 7), and he points out further that the same principle applies elsewhere—for example, in xix 1

तत्र पूर्वपूर्वं प्रथमम् ॥ ३ ॥

3 And here, that which comes first is first taken

That is to say, in the construction of the *samhitā* text, both the words to be treated and the rules to be applied must be taken up in their order, as they stand in the text and in the Prātiśākhya respectively. A variety of instances are given to illustrate the working of the principle. First, in *bhāksha ā ihi* (iii 2 5¹), the first two words are first combined, according to x 2, and then the result, *bhākshā*, is combined with *ihi*, by x 4, making *bhākshē* " 'hi, the true reading, whereas, if the second combination had been first made, forming *e 'hi*, this would have coalesced with *bhāksha* into *bhākshāi 'hi*—which (though in itself, as may well be claimed, the preferable reading) is unauthorized and incorrect. This exemplifies the application of the rule to the order in which words are to be treated, for its application to the use of rules there are three examples. The first concerns the production of the *samhitā*-reading *shannavatyāi* (vii 2 15) from the *pada* reading *shatnavatyāi*: it is accomplished by the successive application of vii 2, which prescribes the conversion of *n* to *n* after *shat*, and of viii 2,

3 tatra samhitāvīdhāne pūrvampūrvam padān sūtram ca prathamam kartavyam yathā bhāksha ā ihi ity atra dīrghañ samānākshare (x 2) iti dīrghah¹ bhākshā ihi iti sthita vvarṇapara ekāram (x 4) ity ekāre kṛte bhākshē " 'hi 'ti bhavati anyathā 'hi 'ti kṛtvā bhākshaḥabde² samdhīyamāne bhākshāi 'hi 'ti syāt tac cā 'nishtam pūrvapada-kartavyatva etad udāharanam pūrvasūtrakartavyatve³ pi⁴ vadāmah yathā⁵ shattri-grāmanishpūrvah (vii 2) iti nakārasya natve kṛta uttamapara uttamāñ savargīyam (viii 2) ity anena⁶ takārasya natve kṛte⁷ shannavatyā iti bhavati anyatho⁸ ttamapara uttamam (viii 2) iti sūtre prathamam⁹ pravṛtte sati¹⁰ shannavatyā iti syāt tac cā 'nishtam tathā¹¹ vatt¹² svayamabhi-gūrtāye 'ty atra tanakārapūrvac ca takārah (v 33)

which changes *t* before *n* to *n* if, on the contrary, the latter rule had been applied first, changing *shat* to *shan*, the former would no longer have had force at all, and the reading would have stood *shannavatyā*. The next case is that in which the words *vat* and *svayamabhogantāya* come together (in 2 8¹ seven times G M read *vashut* for *vat*, doubtless by a clerical error). Here, v 33 requires the insertion of a *t* between the *t* and *s*, and this inserted *t* is then, by xiv 12, made *th*, so that we are finally to read *vatth svay* if the latter conversion were first made, the reading would turn out instead *vatth svay*- (since v 33 would not then apply at all, but to the combination *thsv* would be prefixed a *t* of duplication, by xiv 1,5 the manuscripts, as usual in such cases, do not give these complicated readings altogether correctly and W B even make the blunder of substituting at last *vat svāhā*, apparently having in mind *-vāt svāhā*, in the same division). Once more, in the passage *imam vi syāmi* (11 10² and 11 5 6¹), we are first to convert the *s* of *syāmi* to *sh* by vi 4, and then to duplicate the *sh* by xiv 1, making *vi shshyāmi* if the duplication were first performed, making *vi ssyāmi*, then, by rule vi 4, we should have to read *vi shsyāmi*. Of the three examples thus given, only the first has to do with the form of the text as given in the manuscripts, since these very sensibly ignore the rules for duplication which make up the bulk of the fourteenth chapter of our treatise.

So far as regards the taking up of words for combination in their natural order, the Rik Pr (ii 2) and Ath Pr (iii 38) have rules of like force with the present one

त्रपुमिथुपूर्वः शकारश्चपरः ॥ ४ ॥

4 After *trapu* and *mithu* is inserted a *ç* before *c*

prathama āshmaparo dvitīyam (xiv 12) *iti sūtradhvayam prasaktam tatra pūrvatvāt tanukārapūrvac ca takāra*¹¹ *ity etad eva prathamam kartavyam*¹² *anyathā*¹³ *vattth svayam iti*¹⁴ *syāt tac cā'nishtam athavā imam vi shshyāmi* 'ty atro 'pa-sarganishpūrvō 'nudātte pade (vi 4) *svarapūrvam vy-añjanam*¹⁵ *dvivarnam vyañjanaparam*¹⁶ (xiv 1) *iti sūtra-dhvayam*¹⁷ *prāptam tatra dvitvasūtre*¹⁸ *prathame kārye sati*¹⁹ *vi shshyāmi*²⁰ 'ti *syāt tan mā bhād iti shatvam eva prathamam kartavyam*

*pūrvampūrvam iti*¹⁹ *vīpsā sarvathā*²⁰ 'vam artham samarthayati¹⁹

¹ G M ms *tena* ² W -*dena na* ³ G M om ⁴ W B O om ⁵ G M om ⁶ B O *sati* ⁷ W O *ma* ⁸ G M om ⁹ W B O om ¹⁰ G M *vashath*, B *vata*, O *vatt* ¹¹ G M om ¹² O M put before *prathamam* ⁽¹³⁾ W B *vut svāhe* 'ti, O *vat svayam iti*, G M *vashath svayam iti* ⁽¹⁴⁾ G M om ¹⁵ G M *ti am* ⁽¹⁶⁾ G M *prathamam krie* ¹⁷ G M ms *imam* ¹⁸ B G M *shyami* ⁽¹⁹⁾ G M *vīpsaya svatras 'tad āha 'yam iti samarthanyam*, B *vīpsa sarvatras 'vam arthayati* ²⁰ O *sarvatras*

The passages are *śisam ca me trapuṣ ca me* (iv 7 5¹), and *mīthuṣ carantam upayāti* (iv 7 15²) the existing *pada*-text reads *trapu* and *mīthu*, as this rule would lead us to expect. But the right of *trapuṣ* to be recognized as an independent word by the side of *trapu* is assured by the derivative adjective *trāpusha*, and the close analogy of *manu*, *manuṣ*, *mīnusha*.

The commentator adds a couple of counter-examples one, *vr̥bhū ca me prabhū ca me* (iv 7 4^{1 2}), to show that not every *u* has a *ṣ* added before *c*, the other, *asvā mīthū kah* (iv 6 9⁴), to show that the insertion is only made before *s*, after the words specified.

सुपूर्वश्च चन्द्रपरः ॥ ५ ॥

5 As also after *su*, before *candra*

The example quoted by the commentator is *succandra dasma vīgate* (iv 4 4⁶) the word occurs once more, at ii 2 12⁷. The *pada*-text reads *su-candra*. Counter-examples are *pra candra-māṣa tirati dīrgham āyuh* (ii 4 14¹ G M omit the last two words), and *ā mā sucarite bhaya* (i 1 12) their application is obvious.

संपूर्वः सकारः कुरुपरः ॥ ६ ॥

6 After *sam* is inserted *s* before *kuru*

The commentator's example is *yagamānah saṅskurute* (v 6 6⁴ and vi 5 5²). The *pada*-text reads *sam kurute*. Counter-examples are *purodāgāḥ alam kurv itī* (vi 3 1² G M have a lacuna involving this passage), and *samkr̥tya chāvākasāmam bhavati* (v 4 12³). The text has further *saṅskr̥tya* and *saṅskṛta*, but (as is also implied in rule xvi 26) they are read in the *pada*-text as in *samhitā*, without division, or ejection of the intruded *s*.

अकुर्व च प्रत्ययात्परः ॥ ७ ॥

4 *trapu mīthu evampūrvah cakāra āgamo bhavati caparah¹ yathā śis----- mīth----- evampūrva itī kim vī----- evampara itī kim as-----*

¹ G M *cakarap-*

5 *cakārah cakāram anvādīṣati supūrvah cakāra āgamo bhavati candraparah yathā¹ suṣ----- evampūrva itī kim pra----- evampara itī kim ā mā----- sv ity esha pabdhah pūrvo yasmād asāu supūrvah*

¹ G M om

6 *sam ity evampūrvah sakāra āgamo bhavati kuruparah yathā¹ yaj----- evampūrva itī kim 'pur----- evampara itī kim² sam----- kurupabdhah paro yasmād asāu kuruparah.*

¹ G M om ² G M om

7 And before *akurva*, after the augment.

The passage is, as quoted by the commentator, *ta ishruṃ sam askurvata* (vi 2 3¹), the *pada*-text reading *sam akurvata*. The counter-example is *agnihotram vratam akurvata* (iii 2 2²). As *pratyaya* occurs nowhere else in the treatise, we cannot tell whether it signifies distinctively 'augment,' or, as in other of the Prāticākhyas, 'affix' in general. The commentator gives a scholastic explanation of the term, as indicating "that whereby the consonants are added unto, are made distinct."

नीचापूर्वी दकार उच्चापरः ॥ ८ ॥

8 After *nīcā* is inserted *d* before *uccā*

The passage is *madhyān nīcād uccā* (ii 3 14⁶), and the *pada*-text actually reads *nīcā uccā*. This is a proceeding to which it would be hard to find a parallel in the *pada*-texts of the other Vedas. To write *madhyena* for *madhyāt* just before would be in itself quite as defensible. As counter-examples, we receive *lokam yanty uccāvaca* 'hni (vii 4 3⁶), and *nīcā tam dhakṣi* (i 2 14²).

At the end of the comment is made the remark "the above are cases of insertion" (*āgama*, 'accession'). The matter of irregular conversions is next taken up.

असंपूर्वी ऋमृकारः ॥ ९ ॥

9 After *asam*, *r* becomes *ar*

The passage in which this anomalous change is made is *grhānām asamartyān* (iii 3 8²), where the *pada*-text has, as the rule implies, *asam rtyān*. Here, again, we cannot praise the work of the *pada* text-maker. Nor is the rule of unexceptionable form, for the commentator is obliged to specify that the *asam* intended is one not made up of the parts of two words (not *-a sam*), else such passages as *kalyānī rūpasamrddhā* (vii 1 6⁶), and *vahī hy esha*

7 cakārah sampūrvatvam¹ āgamam² cā³ 'nvādgati akurva 'ce'ti⁴ grahane pratyayāt parah sakāra āgamo bhavaty sampūrvah yathā ta---- pratyayo nāmā'kāra ucyate pratiyanta⁵ abhivyajyante vyajñānāny anene 'ti pratyayah sampūrva iti km agn----

¹ G M -rvam ² G M sakārag- ³ G M om ⁴ W cā, O G M ite ⁵ B O pratiyayante, G M pratiyayante

8 nīcāpūro dakāra āgamo bhavaty uccāparah yathā¹ madh----- evampūrva iti km lok----- evampara iti km nīcā----

āgamā etc.

¹ G M O om

samrddhyā (11 2 2¹) would be included. As counter-example, to show that *r*, not a syllable containing *r*, is liable to the specified conversion, is quoted *asamtrne hi hanā* (vi 2 11³ G M. omit *hanū*)

अवग्रह आशीर्षःसुवरिति रेफं परः सकारः पका-
रम् ॥ १० ॥

10 Of *ācīh*, *dhūh*, and *suvaḥ*, when first members of a compound, the *visarjanīya* becomes *r*, and a following *s* becomes *śh*

The word *avagraha* in this rule is the locative *avagrahe*, says the commentator, and applies to each of the specified words, taken separately. He supplies *visarjanīya*, the omission of which, or of some other word answering the same purpose, is rather a serious defect in the rule. The illustrative passages quoted are *ity ācīr-padaya rā* (vi 2 9⁴, the *pada*-text reads *ācīh-padayā*), *dhārśhā-hāv anagrā* (1 2 8², p *dhūh-sāhāu*), and *dadhishe suvarshām jh-vām agne* (iv 4 4¹, p *suvaḥ sām* W B O omit the first word of the citation, G M the last). The necessity of the specification "when first members of a compound" is shown by the counter-example *ye devā devasuva stha te* (1 8 10² p *deva-suvaḥ* G M omit the first two words and the last). *Ācīh* shows the same irregular combination also in *anācīrkēna* and *sācīrkēna* (1 6 10⁴), but these words are not treated as divisible by the *pada*-text. The commentator goes on to point out the rules to which exceptions are established by this one. viii 23 would require *ācīshpadayā*, and ix 2

9 *asam ity evampūrva rkāro 'ram vikāram āpadyate yathā grh----* *tatra¹ nimuttam ekapadastham² vijñeyam anyathā kaly----* *vahī----* *ity ādāv api bhavet rkāra iti kim asam----*

¹ G M O *atra* ² B -*dasamstham*

10 *avagrahā iti saptamyantam padam ācīhprabhrtibhah pratyekam abhisambadhyate ācīh dhūh suvaḥ ity¹ eteshv avagraheshu visarjanīyo repham āpadyate ebhyaḥ² paro yaḍi sa kārō³ vartate tarhi shukāram⁴ āpadyate yathā⁵ ity---* *dhūr----* *dadh----* *avagraha iti kim ye----* *'kakhapakāraparah⁶ (viii 23) ity anenā⁷ 'ācīshpadaye 'ti prāptam 'aghoṣha-paras tasya sasthānam ūshmānam⁸ (ix 2) iti dhūssāhāu⁹ suvaṣṣām¹¹ iti ca prāptam⁸ tadubhayabhaṅgāyā 'yam ārambhah itigabdhā eṣhām evā 'sha viśesho nā 'nyeshām iti prakāravācī*

¹ G M om ² G M *tebh* ³ G M put before *yaḍi* ⁴ G M so 'ps *shatvam* ⁵ G M om ⁶ G M om *parah* ⁷ G M om ⁸ W om ⁹ B O om ¹⁰ B O *dhūh* ¹¹ B O *suvaḥ*-

dhūssāhū and *suvaśām* (or, as it is customary to write them, *dhūssāhū* and *suvaśām* only G M are conscientious about giving the double sibilant, as demanded by the Prâtiçâkhyâ) The *iti*, he remarks finally, signifies that only the words mentioned, and no others, are intended—that is to say, it has no particular meaning at all. It would be well if he always as frankly acknowledged the insignificance of this word where it occurs in the rules

अथ लोपः ॥ ११ ॥

11 Now for cases of omission

An introductory rule or heading, having force as far as rule 19, below, inclusive

इपूर्वे मकारः ॥ १२ ॥

12 A *m* is dropped, when preceded by *im*

The passage aimed at is *im⁵ andrâ suprayasah* (iv 1 8² p *im mandā*) it is the only one of its kind in the text The Vājasa-neyi-Saṁhitā reads in the corresponding passage (xxvii 15) *im mandrā* To treat the loss of a *m* here as suffered by the second word instead of the first is most arbitrary and unreasonable The particle *im* is reduced to *i* in quite a number of Rik passages, and before other letters than *m* they are duly noted in the Prâtiçâkhyâ (Rik Pr iv 36) A series of counter-examples is added by our commentator *imam me varuna* (u 1 11⁶) shows that *m* is not dropped after another *m* in general, *agnim mitram varunam* (u 1 11¹), that *m* after short *i* does not exercise the specified effect, *imkārya svāhe* "mktāya (vii 1 19¹), that *im* elides no other consonant than *m* The yet farther restriction is applied, that *im* here is a *padagrahana*, 'the citation of a complete *pada*,' for otherwise there would be an elision of a *m* in such cases as *prthvīm mā hūsih* (iv 2 9¹) G M add the further example *uta çrivasā prthvīm mitrasya*, which I am unable to find in the Saṁhitā

तुनुपूर्व उदात्तयोर्वकारः ॥ १३ ॥

11 *athe¹ty ayam adhikārah lopa ity etad adhikrtam vedatavyam ita uttaram yad vakshyāmah ayam adhikāras tishthanty ekayā* (v 19) *itisūtraparyanto vedatavyah*

12 *makāra im ity evampūro lupyate yathā¹ im---- evampūru it kim imam---- dīrghena kim agn- --- im iti padagrahanam² itarathā³ prth----- ity ādāu makāro lupyeta⁴ makāra⁵ iti kin im-----:*

¹ G M om ² W -hacarnah ³ G M anyathā ⁴ G M yate, and add *tac ca* ⁵ mshā. ⁶ W -rapara

13 A *v* is dropped when preceded by *tu* or *nu*, in case these are accented

It is when the particle *vāi*, or *vāva*, follows *tu* and *nu* that this anomalous mutilation is made. The commentator quotes *sa tv 'āi yayeta* (11 6 6³ and 11 13¹ p *suh tu vāi*), and *in nv 'ā upastirnam ichanti* (16 7³ p *it nu vāi*). The same *sandhi* of *tu* and *vāi* is not infrequent elsewhere (the passages are 1 7 1⁴, 6² 11 2 4⁸, 5 4¹ 11 2 9², 3 9², 5 1³ 11 5 9⁴ 11 4 3¹ 11 2 10³), that of *nu* and *vāi* is comparatively rare (only at 1 5 9⁶ twice), that of *tu* and *vāva* I have found only once, at 11 5 6⁵. Here, again, it would seem better to regard the final *u* as suffering elision, instead of the initial *v*. The specification "if accented" is explained as intended to exclude such passages as *anu vtrahatyē* (1 6 12¹, 7 13¹), where *anu* would fall under this rule by 1 52 (even if the *nu* here, like the *im* in the preceding rule, were regarded as a *padaprahanam*). Other counter-examples, of obvious intent, are *idam vām āsye havih* (11 3 11¹), and *pra tu janayati 'ti* (1 7 2⁴) and *vidusho nu yajñam* (1 3 13^{1 2}).

उत्पूर्वः सकारो व्यञ्जनपरः ॥ १४ ॥

14 A *s* is dropped after *ut*, when a consonant follows

The commentator's example is *praty uttabdhyāi sayatvāya* (11 6 4⁶ p *ut-stabdhya*). This is, so far as I have discovered, the only case in the *Sanhitā* from the root *stabh* similar forms from *sthā* occur variously (*anūthāya*, 11 4 10³, *upothāya*, 11 1 6³, 5 15^{1 2}, *utthāsyant*, 11 1 19³, *utthita*, 11 1 19³, 2 9³, and *utthāna*, 11 2 1⁴ thrice). As counter-examples are given *jagatssthā devāh* (11 1 11⁴), *utkṛāṣyate svāhā* (11 1 19³), and *utsādena jhuvām* (1 7 11).

This familiar *sandhi* is also the subject of *Ath Pr 11.18*, and *Vāj Pr 14 95*

एषसस्य इति च ॥ १५ ॥

15 Also *eshah*, *sah*, and *syah*

13 *tu nu¹ ity evampūrvo vakāro lupyate tayos tunvor udāt-tayoh sator iti vibhāgya vāyogo² vyñēyah yathā sa tv.... in nv.... udāttayor iti kim anu.... apy akārādāi (1.52) iti prāptih evampūrva iti kim³ idam.... vakāra iti kim⁴ pra.... vidā... tuḥ ca nuḥ ca tunā⁴ tāu pūrvāu yasmāt sa ta-thoktah*

¹ B O *nu*, as also B in the rule itself ² G M *vny-* ³ B om ⁴ G M *tunu*

14 *vyāñjanaparah sakāra utpūrvo lupyate yathā praty.... vyāñjanam asmāt param ity vyāñjanaparah evampūrva iti kim¹ jag-.... sakāra iti kim ut-.... evampara iti kim ut-....*

Here the *ca*, 'also,' is declared to continue the implication of "when a consonant follows" from the preceding rule. The *iti* is added for the sake of clearness, it shows the final *visarjanīya* of *syah*, and attributes it by analogy to each of the other words also. What indicates that this final *visarjanīya* is the letter which is to suffer elision is not so evident. The illustrative examples are *esha te gāyatraḥ* (iii 1 2¹), *sa te jānāti* (1 2 14^{2 3} but G M substitute *sa tapo 'tapyata*, iii 1 1¹), and *esha sya vājī* (1 7 8³). The counter-example, showing that the omission occurs only before a consonant, is *dama evā 'syāi 'sha upa tishthate* (1 5 7⁴), where, if the *h* of *eshah* were lost by this rule, x 5 would require the reading *esho 'pa*.

The corresponding rules in the other treatises are Rik Pr 11.4, Vāj Pr iii 15, 16, Ath Pr 11 57

नासः ॥ १६ ॥

16 But not *asah*

Namely, in the passage *hrtvaso mayobhān* (iv 2 11³, p *hrtsu-asah*), which would otherwise fall under the preceding rule for *sah*, by 1 52

इद्विद्यन्मान्नौषधीःपरः सः ॥ १७ ॥

17 And *sah*, when followed by *id u*, *id agne*, *imām nah*, *enā*, *oshadhīh*

These are the cases in the Sanhitā where, after the regular loss of the final of *sah*, its vowel is irregularly combined with the one that follows, against rule x 25. Such cases in the other Vedic texts are treated at Rik P1 ii 33, 34, and Vāj Pr iii 14. The commentator quotes the passages affected, as follows *se 'd u hotā so adhvārān* (1 1 14⁴ B O omit the last word, G M the last two), *se 'd agne astu* (1 2 14³), *se 'imām no havayadātīm* (iv 6 6⁶), *sāi 'nā 'nīkena* (iv 3 13² and 6 1⁵), and *sāu 'shadhīr annu rudhyase* (iv 2 3³, 11³). The first two need counter-examples, to show that *it* not followed by *u* or *agne* does not coalesce with *sa* they are *sa y*

15 *vyaktimshaya*¹ *itṛcabdah* *pratyekam* *esha ity ādin*² *visarjanīyāntān*³ *dyotayati* *cahāro vyañjanaparātām anvādīcati* *eshah sah syah* *eshu*⁴ *visarjanīyo vyañjanaparo lupyate yathā*⁵ *esha*---- *sa*---- *esha*---- *evampara itī kim dama*

¹ G M *tvīṣhta*, O *tvīṣhta* ² G M *nām* ³ G M *-yāntātān* ⁴ G M *ins* *padeshu* ⁵ G M *om*

16 *asa ity asmin*¹ *grahane visarjanīyo vyañjanaparo na lupyate hrt*---- *apy akārādī* (1 52) *itī prāpter*² *nishedhah*³

¹ G M *etas-* ² G M *-ti* ³ G M *om*

janena (v 3 14³) and *sa id deveshu gachati* (iv 1 11¹) The third also wants a counter-example, to prove the need of *nah* after *imām* it is found in *sa imām abhy amṛṣat* (v 5 2⁴) Finally, to show that only *sah* undergoes the prescribed effect before the words specified in the rule, we have *paro divā para enā* (iv 6 2²)

अवग्रह इत्येकम् ॥ १८ ॥

18 Also *ity ekam*, when *ekam* is the former member of a compound

The passage aimed at is *pāpīyānt syād ity ekāṅkam tasya juhuyāt* (v 1 1² but as given by W O, without the first two words, it is also found again at v 4 5⁵ G M omit *juhuyāt*), and the *pada*-text actually reads *ekam-ekam* The case is akin with that which forms the subject of the next rule Two counter-examples are given, to justify the terms of the rule they are *ardhukaṇṇ syād ity ekam agre 'tha* (vi 2 3⁵ only G M have the first two words), and *yad ekamekaṇṇ sambharet* (1 6.8²)

तिष्ठत्येकया सपूर्वः ॥ १९ ॥

19 Also *tiṣṭhantya ekayā*, along with the preceding letter

The commentator quotes the passage *tiṣṭhantya ekāṅkayā stritayā* (vii 5 8⁴), the *pada*-reading is *ekayā-ekayā* As counter-example, where the same word remains unmutilated, is given *samānānām karoty ekayāṅkayo 'tsargam* (vi 1 9⁴ only G M have the first word)

In this rule and the foregoing are noted, but at the same time ignored, the first occurrences of the compound *ékāṅka*, which (see the St Petersburg Lexicon) is not very rare in the Çatapatha Brâhmana and later

17 ----- ¹ *evamparah sahkāra² ity atra visarjanīyo lupyate yāthā se 'd----- se 'd----- v³ agna ity ābhyām⁴ kim sa ----- sa----- se----- na iti kim 'sa----- sār----- sāv----- sa iti kim paro-----*

¹ G M ins *iti* ² W B O *sakāra*, G M *sa* ³ W B *id*, G M O *u* ⁴ B O *etābhyām* ⁵ A lacuna in B, to near the end of the comment on rule 18

18 *itiṣabḍaviṣiṣṭa ekam ity asminn avagrahe makāro lupyate yāthā¹ pāp----- avagraha iti kim ardh----- itiṣabḍaviṣiṣṭa iti kim 'yad---*

¹ G M om ² End of the lacuna in B

19. *tiṣṭhantiṣabḍaviṣiṣṭa ekaye 'ty asmin grahane 'ntyo¹ varnah sapūrvah pūrvasahito lupyate yāthā². tiṣh----- tiṣṭhanti³ 'ti kim sam----- pūrvana saha vartata iti sapūrvah*

¹ G M *yavaro* ² O om

The terms in which the rule is expressed show that, from rule 15 on, the implication has been of a "final" letter as liable to the effect prescribed. We have reason to be surprised that it was not distinctly stated when first made

नकारः शकारं चपरः ॥२०॥

20 A *n*, when followed by *c*, becomes *ç*

The commentator's illustrative examples are *ahñç ca sarvān jambhayan* (iv 5 1²), *rtāñç ca tasya nakshatryām ca* (vii 1 3² G M omit *ca*), and *karnāñç cā 'karnāñç ca* (i 8 9³). The counter-examples, to show that only *n* is so changed, and *n* itself only before *c*, not before other palatal mutes, are *çam ca me* (iv 7 3¹), and *tān chandobhir annu* (i 5 9⁷ G M omit *annu*)

The nature of the conversion taught in this rule, and of the kindred ones forming the subject of rules vi 14 and ix 20, as being a historical, not a euphonic process, has been sufficiently explained and illustrated in the note to Ath Pr ii 26. At the same place will be found noted the usage of the other Vedic texts as regards the *sandhi* ñç: the Atharvan and the Vājasaneyi-Saṁhitā make it uniformly, the Rik only occasionally. In the Tāttvīya-Saṁhitā it is prevailingly usual. I have noted thirty-nine examples of it, against the eight exceptions mentioned in the next rule.

The definition of the *sandhi*, of course, is not complete without the aid of rules xv 1-3, which teach that, where *n* has been converted into a sibilant, the preceding vowel is nasalized, or has *anusvāra* added to it. A better course, according to our understanding of the history of the phenomenon, would be to teach the insertion of a *s* (or *visaryanīya*) and the change of *n* to *anusvāra* before it: but the makers of the Prāticākhyas concern themselves much less about the theoretical accuracy than the mechanical aptitude of their rules.

नायन्नैर्यन्नाधुवन्नडान्वृणीवान्वारुणानेवास्मिन् ॥२१॥

21 But not the *n* of *āyan*, *ūrayan*, *ārdhnuvan*, *anadvān*, *ghrñvān*, *vārunān*, and *evā smin*

The passages are *lokam āyan catasrah* (v 2 3⁴), *yām ūrayan*

20 *caḥāraparo*¹ *nakārah caḥāram āpadyate yathā*² *ah-----*
rt----- *kar-----* *nakāra itī kim çam-----* *capara itī kim*
tāñ----- *cañ*³ *paro yasmād asdu caparah*

¹ G M *caparo* ² O om ³ G M O *caḥārah*

21 ----- *eteshu*¹ *grahaneshu nakārah caḥāram nā* "padyate
caparo 'pi *yathā*² *lo-----* *yām-----* *loka-----* *anad-----*
ghrñ----- *vār-----* *evā-----* *'eve* 'tī *kim* ³ *asm-----*

¹ G M *eshu* ² G M O om ³ B om

candramasī (11 9³), *loka ārdhnuvan carunā 'smīn* (v 5 1⁵ only G M have the first word), *anadvān ca me dhenū ca me* (iv 7 10²), *ghrñvān cetati tmanā* (ii 5 11¹), *vārunān catuṣhkapālān nīr va-
pet* (ii 3 12¹ only W has the last two words), and *evā 'smīn cak-
shur dhattah* (ii 2 9^{3 4}, 3 8²) *Evā 'smīn* is found once more, in a
slightly different connection, at ii 3 8¹ the others occur only in
the passages cited. A counter-example, *asmiñ ca 'mushmāñ ca*
(vii 3 4^{1, 5}), is given to prove the need of specifying *eva* before
asmin.

By rule 24, below, the *n* in all these cases is assimilated to the
c, and should be so written in the text. My own manuscript of the
Sanhitā, in fact, follows the authority of the Prātiśākhya, and rep-
resents the assimilated nasal in the same manner as an assimilated
m, except in a single case (*ārdhnuvan car-*). The Calcutta edition,
however, in the part hitherto published, gives *n c* only once (i 1 9³),
and everywhere else *n c*.

तकारश्चकारः शचरूपः ॥२२॥

22 A *t*, when followed by *ç*, *c*, or *ch*, becomes *c*

The form assumed by initial *ç* after this assimilation is taught
in rules 34-37, below

The commentator's examples are *tac chamyoḥ* (ii 6 10^{2, 3}),
tac cā 'daduḥ (vii 1 5³), and *tac chandasām chandastvam* (v 6 6¹).
He proceeds to point out that the *ç*, *c*, and *ch*, all mentioned in the
rule as upon the same footing, are to be understood as original
(not the products of previous euphonic processes), that being their
chief or primary value otherwise the mention of *ç* at all would
be superfluous, since, the *ç* being (by v 34) ordered changed to *ch*
after a mute, it would be enough for this rule to say "when fol-
lowed by *c* or *ch*". Moreover, if the latter rule were applied, then,
after it, the application of the earlier rule would not be suitable
(*svarasa*, 'having its own proper flavor,' the word is not used else-
where), as it would constitute an offense against the third rule of
this chapter

22 *çacachāparas takāraç cakāram āpadyate yathā tac----*
tac---- tac---- *atra çacachāpara iti sāmānyoktānām¹ ni-*
mittānām² prākr̥t̥vām³ vyñeyam mukhyatvāt tatra⁴ prākr̥ta-
vākṛt̥ayoh prākr̥tam⁵ mukhyam anyathā çakāragrahanavādyar-
thyāt⁶ kuto vādyarthīyam sparçapūrvāḥ çakāraç çakā-
ram (v 34) *iti çakārasya chatve kr̥te takāraç cakāram çacachāpara⁷*
ity etdvatī⁸ 'va siddher⁹ iti br̥mah kim ca parastūtre pravṛtte
sati paçcāt pūrvasūtraprasaranam na svarasam¹⁰ tatra pū-
vampūrvam prathamam (v 3) *iti nyamabhaṅgaprasaṅgāt¹⁰*

¹ G M B O *nyeno 'kt-* ² W O *pran-* ³ G M *prākr̥tat-* ⁴ G M *om*
⁵ G M *tatvam* ⁶ G M *-yāc ca* ⁷ G M B *çacacha-* ⁸ G M *sūthr* ⁹ G M
bhavati ¹⁰ G M *nyāyabh-*

तपरो त्रकारम् ॥ २३ ॥

23. When followed by *j*, it becomes *j*.

The cited example is *taj jayādnām jayatvām* (iii.4.4): rather superfluously, a counter-example is also given: *tat pravāte* (vi.4.7²).

नकार एतेषु अकारम् ॥ २४ ॥

24. A *n*, before the same letters, becomes *ñ*.

As *eteshu* is plural, we are obliged, having recourse to that which lies nearest, to regard as implied the letters pointed out in the last two rules as requiring certain changes in those that precede them: that is to say, *ç*, *c*, *ch*, *j*. These are, in fact, the whole class of palatals, since *ñ* never occurs at the beginning of a word, nor, indeed, in any independent position, and since *jñ* is found nowhere in any Vedic text. The dental *n*, then, never maintains itself before a palatal, but is assimilated to it. The other treatises teach virtually the same doctrine: see note to Ath. Pr. ii.11.

The commentator's illustrative example for *n* before *ç* (where, to complete the combination, rule 34 below has also to be applied) is *tenāi 'vāi 'nān chamayati* (iii.4.8⁴). As for *n* before *c*, he points out that the rule applies only to the cases where the *n* does not become *ç* by v.20, as excepted by v.21, and quotes again one of the examples given under the latter rule, *lokam āyañ catasrah* (v.2.3⁴). Before *ch*, he gives the phrase already quoted as counter-example under v.20, *tāñ chandobhir anu* (i.5.9⁷); and before *j*, *aparūpam ātmañ jāyate* (iii.5.7³). As general counter-example, finally, he gives *tānt subdhān* (ii.4.1¹), where *n*, coming before *s*, is treated in a quite different manner.

The occurrence of *n* before *ch*, which does not once happen in the Atharvan, is found not less than nine times in the Tāittirīya-Saṁhitā. My own MS. reads every time *nch*, combining the dental nasal with the palatal aspirate. The Calcutta edition, at the only place which it contains as yet, reads *ñch*.

23. *sāmnidhyāt takāra iti labhyate: japaras takāro jakāram āpadyate. yathā¹: taj----- evampara iti kim: tat-----*

¹ G. M. om.

24. *eteshu iti bahuvacananirdeçāt¹ pratyāsannam evā 'napekshya' sūtradvayastheshu paranimitteshu sampratyaya²: tasmād eteshu iti: çacachajeshu³ parata⁴ ity arthaḥ: nakāro. ñakāram āpadyate. yathā⁵: te-----: çapvāpattāu nishiddho⁶ yo nakārah so 'tra caparatvena vishayīkriyate. lok-----: tāñ-----: apa----- evampara iti kim: tānt-----*

¹ W. -rāç-. ² G. M. 'navek-. ³ G. M. praty-. ⁴ W. O. -chabhujeshu. ⁵ W. para; G. M. pareshv. ⁶ G. M. om. ⁷ G. M. B. O. put after *yo*.

The combination of final *n* with initial *ḡ*, producing, according to all the phonetic text-books (with trifling exceptions see note to Ath Pr 11.17), *ṅch*, is decidedly of more common occurrence. But here, too, my own MS reads, with but a single exception among the cases which I have noted, *nch* the Calcutta text is inconsistent with itself, now giving *ṅ* (as at 11.2 12³), now *n* (as at 13 9¹)

Final *n* is found yet more frequently before initial *ḡ*, or some scores of times in all. As regards its method of writing the combination, my manuscript is about equally divided between *ny* and *my*. The Calcutta text is equally wavering, and there is no approach to consistency between the two authorities, or to recognizable principle in either. In both alike, the variation seems wholly accidental and arbitrary.

Such being the case, I think it clear that a careful editor of the *Tāttiriya-Saṅhitā* ought to disregard, as of no authority or consequence, the variations, or the unanimity, of his manuscripts upon all these points, and to adopt uniformly the reading prescribed by the *Prāṭigākhyā* (either *ṅ* or *m*), wherever a final *n* comes to stand before a palatal mute.

तपरौ तकारम् ॥ २५ ॥

25 Both *t* and *n*, when followed by *l*, become *l*

The dual *laparāu* indicates that the *t* and *n*, already treated of, are the letters aimed at in this rule, says the commentator. He cites as examples *yal lohitaṃ parāpatat* (11.17² G M omit the last word), and *trīṇ lokān ud āyayat* (1.7 11¹ only G M have *ud āyayat*). The combination of *n* and *l* is finished by the next rule, and will be further remarked upon in the note thereto.

नकारो ऽनुनासिकम् ॥ २६ ॥

26 The *n* becomes nasalized *l*

As the nasal quality of *n* itself is already established by rule 11.30, explains the commentator, it could not properly be defined here again as nasal. Hence the *anunāsikam* of the present precept must be understood as qualifying the *l* of like position into which the *n* is converted. This *l* is to be a nasal *l*. No additional example is given, the combination having been illustrated under the preceding rule.

There are in the *Tāttiriya-Saṅhitā* over a hundred cases of the meeting of final *n* with initial *l*, and in fully two-thirds of them

25 *divāvacanasāmarthyād¹ grhītāu prakrītāu² takāranakārāu lakāram āpadyete³ laparāu yathā⁴ yal.... trīṇ.... laḥ⁵ paro yābhyām tāu laparāu*

¹ G M. *thya* ² G M. om ³ MSS. *-yate* ⁴ G M om ⁵ G M. *lakārah*

my MS reads *nl* simply, without attempting any accommodation of the two sounds to one another. In the remaining cases, it treats the *n* in the same way as it would treat a *m*, substituting for it the ordinary *anusvāra*-dot over the preceding *akṣhara*. The Calcutta text varies between *nl* and *ñl*. Here, as in the cases treated above, there seems to be every reason why an editor should follow one consistent method, as the irregularities of the manuscripts have no ground but accident—and, not less certainly, the method prescribed by the *Prātigākhya* is the one better entitled to be followed. As to the way in which the nasal *l* shall be represented, there may be some question. As I have already mentioned (note to ii 30), I cannot think that the designation of the Calcutta edition is at all to be commended, since it properly implies the insertion of an *anusvāra* between the preceding vowel and a doubled *l*, and thus quite distorts the character of the combination—except as this is viewed by Ātreya, as noted in a later rule (v 31). The method followed in my MS, on the other hand, is theoretically unobjectionable, since there is no phonetic difference recognized, or to be recognized, by phonetic theory between the combination of *n* and *l* and that of *m* and *l*—it has only the practical inconvenience of not distinguishing to the eye these two combinations—and this is of very small account, since there can be few if any cases where the least ambiguity would result. If the nasal *l* is to be written separately, it should properly have the *virāma* beneath and the sign of nasality over it. That is to say, one ought always to print either **अस्मिल् लोके** or **अस्मिं लोके**, not **अस्मिँलोके**.

In romanized text, as the assimilated *m* is represented by *m*, so, by an analogous method and for the sake of convenient distinction, the assimilated *n* may be very suitably represented by *n*, and this is the sign with which I have chosen to write it, both before *l* and before the palatals.

All the *Prātigākhyas* (see note to Ath Pr ii 35) agree in converting both *n* and *m* before *l* into a nasal *l*.

मकार् स्पर्शपरस्तस्य सस्थानमनुनासिकम् ॥ २७ ॥

27 A *m*, when followed by a mute, becomes a nasal of like position with it.

The commentator's examples are *yam kāmāyeta* (i 6 10⁴ et al), *cam ca me* (iv 7 3¹), *tam te dūcākṣhāh* (iii 2 10²), and *tam prat-*

26 *anusvārottamā¹ anunāsikāh* (ii 30) *iti nakārasya² 'nu-nāsikatve siddhe³ punar atrā⁴ 'pi tatkāthanam anupapannam tasmād atra lakṣhanayā nakāro nāma tatsthāno lakāra⁵ ity arthah asā⁶ anunāsikam bhayate⁷ pūrvoktam evo⁸ 'dāharanam*

¹ W namu anunāsivā- ² G M ins 'pi ³ G M nak ⁴ G M ins lakāro
⁵ G M bhayeta

nathā (1 4 9) Of *m* before a lingual he is able to give no example, as such a concurrence is not to be found in the *Sanhitā*

अन्तस्थापरश्च सवर्णमनुनासिकम् ॥ २८ ॥

28 Followed by a semivowel, it becomes a nasal of like quality with it

From the class of semi-vowels is excepted *r*, by the next rule. Examples are given for the others, as follows *saṃyattā āsam* (1 5 1¹ et al), *suvarṅgam lokam* (1 5 4⁴ et al), *saṃvatsarah* (1 5 1³ et al the *pada*-text, like that of the Atharvan, reads *saṃ-vat-sarah*, while that of the Rik leaves the word undivided) No attempt is made in the manuscripts or the printed text of the *Sanhitā* to give a special representation to these nasal semi-vowels standing for an assimilated *m* it is left to be understood that the sign of nasality over the preceding *akṣhara* stands for a nasal letter of like quality with the following consonant in the case of the semi-vowels, just as in that of the mutes, provided for by the preceding rule. Nor are the manuscripts of the *Prāticākhya* and its commentary any more particular—saving that G M usually write, instead of *my*, the combination *yy*, without any sign of the nasality of the first *y*

Only the Ath Pr disagrees with our treatise in its treatment of *m* before the semi-vowels, acknowledging no nasal *y* or *v*, but a *l* alone (see note to Ath Pr 11 35)

The commentator explains the word *anunāsika*, 'nasal,' in the rule, by *anunāsikadharmaviśiṣṭa*, 'distinguished by nasal quality,' but afterward raises a difficulty over it, in terms which imply that he regards it as a noun, 'a nasal,' asking, how we are to understand it here as equivalent to *sānunāsika*, 'combined with nasality' As it is, in fact, originally and properly an adjective, signifying 'possessed of nasal quality,' and is constant-

27 *sparṣaparo makāras tasya sparṣasya sasthānam anunāsikam¹ bhayate yathā² yam---- gam---- tam---- tam---- samānam sthānam yasyā³ 'sāu sasthānah tam³ sparṣah paro yasmād asū sparṣaparah*

¹ W om ² G M om ³ B G M om

28 *cakāro makāram anvādicati antasthāparō makāras tasyā antasthāyāḥ savarnam sadṛṣam anunāsikam¹ anunāsikadharmaviśiṣṭam bhayate yathā sam----- suv----- sam----- nanv anunāsikam ity anena sānunāsikam² katham labhyate³ ucyate⁴ natarām parihārah⁵ yato dharmavācakah śabdo dharmīnam⁶ apī⁷ kathamayati⁸ gukṣah pato nīlam utpalam ity ādivat⁹*

¹ B O om ² W om, O ity anena sānunāsikam katham upalambhamāhe, G M sakalam upalambhamāhe yathā ³ O om. ⁴ W dharmena ⁵ W avika, O avī. ⁶ G M ins yatha ⁷ G M adī

ly so used and applied in the Prāṭicākhya, the difficulty is worse than hair splitting, it is a downright perversion. The answer by which it is met is a quibble worthy of being matched with it "because a word expressing a quality also designates the object possessing that quality, as, for example, when we say 'a white cloth,' 'a blue lotus,'" As if the words "white" and "blue" strictly applied to the color alone, and did not just as properly mean 'of white color,' 'of blue color'."

न रेफपरः ॥ २९ ॥

29 But not when followed by *r*

R being also a semi-vowel, *m* would be converted into a corresponding nasal before it by the previous rule, but for this special exception. The instances given of the treatment of *m* before *r* are *pra samrāyam prathamam adhvarānām* (16 12³ G M have only the first two words), and *sāmrāyāya sukratuḥ* (18 16¹). They are particularly ill selected, as neither case comes under the action of the preceding rule, they fall, rather, under xii 4, and are, in fact, the two passages there given as examples of the peculiar treatment of *sa* before *rāy*. We ought to have, instead, such passages as *pratyushtaṅ rakshaḥ* (11 2¹), *vi vayanṅ ruḥema* (11 2²)—which, of course, are of exceedingly frequent occurrence in the Saṁhitā.

The omission of *m* before *r*, and the nasalization of the preceding vowel, or the insertion of *anusvāra* after the latter, are taught below, in rules xii 2, xv 1-3. The written and printed texts are consistent in their recognition of the mode of combination thus prescribed, always setting the proper *anusvāra* sign before *r*, while before *y*, *l*, *v* they write the assimilated *m* just as before the mutes.

यवकारपरश्चैषामाचार्याणाम् ॥ ३० ॥

30 Nor, according to some teachers, when followed by *y* or *v*

The authorities referred to, of course, would leave the *m* to be treated before these letters as before *r*, and would acknowledge no

29 *antasthātṛvād rephaparasyā¹ 'pi makārasya tatsavarṇānu-
nāsikaprāptir² anena nishadhyate na khalu rephaparo³ makā-
rah pūrvoktam bhagate yathā⁴ pra---- sām----- rephaḥ
parō yasmād asāu rephaparah.*

¹ G M *rephasya tatp-* ² G M *-kapatih prāptā* ³ G M *pakaro* ⁴ G M om.

30 *caḥaro nishedhānvādeḥakah¹ prakṛto² makāra ekeshām
ācāryānām pakṣhe yakāraparo vā³ vakāraparo⁴ vā na savarnam
anunāsikam bhagate yathā⁵ sam- sam-*

¹ G M *ākarsahakah* ² W B *prāk-* ³ R O om ⁴ B om ⁵ G M om

nasal semi-vowel save *l*. Their opinion is again quoted in connection with the rule respecting the actual treatment of *m* before *r* (xiii 3), and the commentator there calls attention to the fact that the "some teachers" spoken of are the same with those here noticed who they are, he does not attempt to tell us. The view held by them is the same with that taken by the Atharva Prātiçākhyā, as pointed out above (see Ath Pr ii.35, and the note upon it), but, until we know much more than we do at present of the history and mutual relations of these phonetic treatises, it would be highly venturesome to conclude that the authors of this Prātiçākhyā had here in mind the other one and its authors.

I find it difficult to discover any good phonetic reason why the assimilation of *m* should not yield a like result before all the semi-vowels, and why, if we are to admit an *anusvāra* at all, it would not find a particularly appropriate place as representing the sound into which *m* might naturally pass before *y*, *r*, *l*, and *v*.

As examples, are repeated *samvatsarah* and *samyattāh* (see under rule 28, above)

उत्तमलभावात्पूर्वी ञुनासिक इत्यत्रियः ॥३१॥

31 Âtreya holds that, when a nasal mute becomes *l*, the previous vowel is nasalized

As has been pointed out above, Âtreya's view of the combination is the one represented accurately by the mode of writing adopted in the Calcutta edition. It is not elsewhere supported in the Prātiçākhyas. Its quotation here seems a little unprepared, or the expression of it given in the rule imperfect, as we have been directed to convert *m* and *n*, not into *l*, but into a nasal *l*. One might think, too, that it would be in better place at the beginning of chapter xv, where certain other differences of opinion on kindred points are rehearsed.

The commentator gives Âtreya the title of *muni*, 'sage,' instead of *âcārya*, 'teacher.'

To illustrate the sage's style of making the combination, he cites *trīṇ lokān* (i 7 11¹) and *svargaṇi lokam* (i 5 4⁴ et al.), but not one of the manuscripts of the commentary takes the pains to write the extracts as they should be written, to serve their purpose as illustrations. Finally, he adds the caution that "this rule and the preceding are not approved."

उपूर्वः ककारः सषकारपरः ॥३२॥

31 *uttamasya nakārasya makārasya¹ vā labhāvāḥ lakārāpatteh pūrvavarō 'nūnāsiko bhavati 'ty ātreya nāma munir manyate yathā² trīṇ----- suv----- uttamayor labhāva uttamalabhāvā³ tasmāt*

sūtradvayam etad anishtam

¹ G M put before *nak-* ² G M om ³ G M om

32 After *ñ* is inserted a *k* before *s* and *śh*

The commentator's examples are *pratyāñk samo atadrutah* (1 8 21 but G M have instead *sadrñk samānāh*, 11 2 8⁶), and *pratyāñk śhadaho bhavati* (vii 4 2⁵ O G M omit *bhavati*) As counter-examples, showing that the insertion is made only under the circumstances specified, he gives *pratyāñ hotāram* (vi 3 1⁵), and *tat savituh* (1 5 6⁴ et al) and *tat śhodaçī* (vi 6 11¹)

The combinations here treated of are not otherwise than rare in any Vedic text In the Tāttirīya-Saṁhitā I have found no other instance of the meeting of *ñ* and *śh* than the one quoted, of *ñ* before *s*, besides the two here given, occur two others, at vi 3 1⁶ and iv 4 4^{7 8}, but, in the latter passage, the division of the section into half-centuries falls between the two letters, as the text is at present written, and prevents the exhibition of the *sandhi* Neither the Calcutta edition (so far as yet printed) nor my manuscript makes in any of these passages the insertion required by the Prāticākhya and it may properly enough be considered a question whether the latter's authority ought to be followed in a matter of this character, any more than in regard to the duplications which form the subject of chapter xiv Nevertheless, considering the phonetic reasonableness of this particular insertion, and its close analogy with that of *t* between *n* and *s* (see the next rule), I should myself decidedly incline to write *ñk s* and *ñk śh* The manuscripts of the commentary, it should be remarked, try to follow the directions of the rule, W B O reading *ñks*, and W O *ñkśh* (with the *k* and *śh* united in the usual sign for *kśh*), while G M even yield to the requirement of xiv 12, and give us *ñkhs* and *ñkħśh* This last is a refinement which no one, probably, would care to see introduced into our printed texts

As is shown in detail in the note to Ath Pr 11.9, the teachings of the Ath Pr and Vāj Pr are virtually in agreement with those of our own treatise as regards the insertions prescribed in this rule and the next, while the Rik Pr merely mentions them as enjoined by some authorities

टनकारपूर्वश्च तकारः ॥ ३३ ॥

33 After *t* or *n* is inserted a *t*

The examples given for these combinations are *vashatt svāhā* (vi 3 12 nine times), and *vidvānt somena yajate* (iii 2 2³), and, in order not to be without an illustration for the collision of *t* with *śh*, one is dragged in from the *jatā* text *anāyājāu śhatt śhad anāyājāu anāyājāu śhat* (vi 6 3³) to which G M even add, from the

32 *sakāraparah¹ śhakāraparo vā kakāra āgamo bhavati ṇa-pūrvah yathā praty-.... praty-.... evampara iti km: praty-.... evampūrva iti km tat-.... tat-....*

¹ G M ins *vā*

same source, *tānt subdhānt subdhāns tāns tānt subdhān* (ii 4 1¹). Counter-examples are *shad vā rtavah* (iii 4 8⁶), and *tān rudrā abruvan* (v 5 2⁶).

The final lingual *t* occurs before *s*, according to my notes upon the text, in ten other passages (iii 2 8¹ eight times iv 4 8¹, 6 1⁴ v 4 3⁴, 4², 5 2⁶ vi 2 3⁴, 6 3³ vii 1 5¹, 4 10²), and my MS does not once employ the intermediate *t*. The manuscripts of our commentary, however, all introduce it, and this time B abets G M in converting it into *th*, by rule xiv 12. The combination is without doubt a very troublesome one, in the demand it makes upon the tip of the tongue but whether the transition is helped by the intrusion of a *t* is a much more serious question—and one to exercise and gratify the subtlety of a Hindu phonetist. The Ath Pr also requires *tis* (ii 8), but the Rik Pr (iv 6) only notices the mode of *sandhi* as enjoined by certain teachers.

It is indeed true that the strict letter of the rule requires a *t* to be inserted between a *t* and *sh*, as illustrated by the commentator from the *ṣatā*-text. But it would be wholly preposterous to suppose that the authors of the Prātiśākhya intended to teach any such insertion—which would convert the consonant combination from one wholly natural and easy to one in a high degree harsh and difficult, if not absolutely impossible. They evidently relied on the non-occurrence of *sh* after *t* anywhere in the Sanhitā for the annulling of that part of the rule's prescription—either having no regard to a *ṣatā*-text, or overlooking the fact that in it the two letters would come in contact.

Twice in the Tāttiriya text we have a final *t* before an initial *sh* (at v 5 2⁶ vii 5 6³). Although their collision might seem to call for mediation in somewhat the same manner as that of *t* and *s*, the Prātiśākhya makes no special provision for it, and the manuscript text simply combines the two letters.

The meeting of final *n* with initial *s*, the other case contemplated by the rule, is very frequent (there are sixty instances in the first two *kāndas*. I have not collected them through the whole text). Neither the printed text nor my manuscript is absolutely faithful in inserting the prescribed *t*, yet I have found but six cases in the whole Sanhitā in which the latter omits it, and out of the seven passages in *kāndas* 1 and 11 where the former leaves it out, my manuscript confirms the omission in only one. As the requirement of the Prātiśākhya receives so much support from the usage of the scribes, and also accords with the prescriptions of the Ath Pr (ii 9) and Vāj Pr (iv 14), there can be no question that it ought to be followed by an editor of the Tāttiriya Veda.

33 cakārah sashakārāv anvāḍṣati takārapārvo vā¹ nakāra-
pārvo vā takāra āgamo bhavati sashakāraparah vash-
vid-.... anū-.... tānt-.... evampara iti kim shad-
tān-....

¹ B om

स्पर्शपूर्वः शकारश्चकारम् ॥ ३४ ॥

34 A *ç* preceded by a mute becomes *ch*

The commentator gives only an example of a *ç* converted into *ch* after *t*, the *t* at the same time becoming *c* by rule 22, above *çarac chrāduṭrī* (iv 3 2²) He adds a counter-example, *āçuh çarānah* (iv 6 4¹) The occurrence of any other final mute than *t* and *n* (for which an example is given above, under rule 24) before initial *ç* is very rare (excepting *m*, for which see the following rule), and it is properly only after a dental, or after a dental or lingual, that the conversion here prescribed has good phonetic ground—namely, in the coalescence of a *t*-sound and a *sh*-sound into the compound sound of our *ch* in *church* (see note to Ath Pr ii 17) There is one case of a preceding *t* (i 3 14⁶), where my MS reads, as the Pratiçākhya directs, *t ch*, while the Calcutta text has *t ç* A single case of preceding *p* is treated of below, in rule 36

न मकारपूर्वः ॥ ३५ ॥

35 But not when preceded by *m*

By this rule, says the commentator, is annulled the conversion of *ç* to *ch* after *m*, which would otherwise be in order (according to the preceding rule), since *m* is a mute He instances *sañcitum me* (iv 1 10³ and v 1 10²) and *sañçravā ha* (i 7 2¹) Being thus specially exempted from the operation of the foregoing rule, this combination, of course, falls under xii 2 and xv 1-3, and the *m*, as before other spirants, becomes *anusvāra* An objection is raised against the pertinence of the present precept, on the ground that xii 2 directs the omission of *m* before a spirant, and that hence there could arise no occasion for any such conversion of *ç* into *ch* as is here contemplated and guarded against The reply, however, is a very easy one, that, by rule 3 of this chapter, the requirement of the conversion into *ch*, as it is stated earlier, would have to be applied first, and that the result of so doing would be to pro-

34 *çakāraç çalāram āpadyate sparçapūrvah¹ yathā² çarac----*, *evampūrva iti kim āçuh----* *sparçah pūrvo yas-mād asāu sparçapūrvah*

¹ G M puts first ² W G M om

35 *maḥāpūrvah çakāraç çalāram nā¹ padyate yathā sañ----- sañ----- sparçatvān makārasya² tatpūrve³ çakāre⁴ prāptam chatvam⁴ anena nishidhyate nanv etad anupapañnam⁵ 'atha makāralopah⁶ (xiii 1) repḥoshmaparah (xiii 2) iti makārasya lopavidhānān na⁶ çakārasya chatvāpattiṇimittam⁷ asti⁸ 'ti māi⁸ 'vam⁸ 'chatvāpādaham malopāpādahāt pūrvam atas^{1,8} tatra pūrvampūrvam prathamam⁹ (v 3) ity nyā-*

duce, in the passage already quoted, the reading *samchitam me brahma*, which is wrong

पकारपूर्वश्च वाल्मीकिः ॥३६॥

36 Nor, according to Vālmīki, when preceded by *p*

There is but a single case in the Sanhitā of *p* before *ç*, namely the one here quoted by the commentator, *anushtup chārādī* (iv 3 2²) so my manuscript reads, according to the requirement of rule 34, above Vālmīki thinks it would be better to read *anushtup çārādī*—and I presume we shall have little hesitation in approving his opinion

व्यञ्जनपरः पौष्करसादेर्न पूर्वश्च जकारम् ॥३७॥

37 Nor, according to Pāushkarasādi, when followed by a consonant, and a preceding *n*, in that case, does not become *ñ*

This translation is made in accordance with the commentator's exposition. One might be tempted to understand the last part of the rule otherwise, not regarding the continuance of the negative as implied from the other part, translating 'and a preceding *n* becomes *ñ*,' but, besides the authority of the comment against it, this would be a mere repetitious enactment of the rule already given above (v 24) The inquiry is raised, how we know that *pūrvah*, 'the preceding letter,' means here 'a preceding *n*' The reply is, because only *n* is liable to conversion into *ñ*, and annulment is only made of that which would, without direction to the contrary, be liable to take place

The examples given to illustrate this peculiar view of Pāushkarasādi are *ādityān çmaçrubhīh* (v 7 12), and *pāpīyān çreyase* (i 5 7⁴) The edition has *pāpīyān chreyase* in the latter passage, in accordance with the approved rules of the Prātigākhya, but my MS seems to have been written by a sectary of Pāushkarasādi at this point (namely, in the margin a line or two of the context was omitted just here by the original scribe) In the former, I

yena chatvam eva pūrvam¹⁰ kartavyam syāt tathā sati makāra sparṇas¹¹ tatpare¹² çakāre chatvam¹³ āpanne sam---- iti syāt tan mā bhūd ity etat sūtram upapannam eva

(¹) B om, excepting *lokavādhānan na* ² G M -*vasya* ³ G M -*rasya* ⁴ G M put before *prapīam* (⁵) G M O om ⁶ G M put before *astī* ⁷ G M *ttatvān* (⁸) G M *chatvāpādāḥasya sūtrasya malopasya ca chatvāpādāḥasya* 'va sapurvatvāt' ⁹ W B O om ¹⁰ G M om ¹¹ B *ça* (¹²) G M *īasye* 'ti makāre ākaram' ¹³ B *pare*

36 *çakārah pratishedhārīhakah¹ vālmīker mate pakārapūrvah² çakāraç çakāram³ nā* "padhyate yathā an-----

¹ B G M *dhākarshakah* ² G M *pūpu* ³ G M *chatvam*

find the reading *ādityān chmacrubhik*, which would satisfy neither side. There is one other case of the collision of *n* with *gr* (at v 6 7³), where I find read *n chr*. So also, at v 7 1³ my MS has *n chv*, and at vi.3 14, *n chy*. These are the only instances, I believe, which the text affords of the combinations contemplated by the rule.

The commentator, at the end, declares this rule and the preceding not approved, and with reason the evident intent of the treatise is that the conversion of initial *ç* to *ch* shall take place in all the cases falling under rule 34.

प्रथमपूर्वे कृकारश्चतुर्थ तस्य सस्यानं प्लाक्षिकौण्डि-
न्यगौतमपौष्करसादीनाम् ॥ ३८ ॥

38 According to Plākshi, Kāundinya, Gāutama, and Pāushkarasādi, a *h* preceded by a first mute becomes a fourth mute corresponding with the latter.

The examples of this, the approved and customary combination of an initial *h* with a final surd mute, are, as given by the commentator, *arvāg ghy enam* (vi.3 3¹), *sarad dhavā aṇvasya* (v 3 12² G M omī *aṇvasya*), and *tad dhiranyam* (v 4 2³ and vi 1 7¹). In giving the first two quotations, W O G M (following a vicious and indefensible mode of combination, which occasionally appears even in carefully written Vedic manuscripts, and has incautiously been admitted into some edited texts) write *ghgh* and *dhdh* instead of *ggh* and *ddh*, and in the latter of them my MS of the Sanhitā does the same (see the note to xiv 5). As counter-examples, establishing the restrictions imposed by the rule, we have *pratyañ hotāram* (vi.3 1⁵), *vāk ta ā pyāyatām* (i 3 9¹), *vashat te* (ii 2 12⁴), and, in W, *ā tishthapat te* (iv 6 9⁴), but in all the other MSS *tat te* (i 3 9¹ et al.)

This is one of several instances in which the Prāṇcākhya, instead of stating first, categorically, its own doctrine, and then mentioning others at variance with this, puts forward the conflicting views of different authorities, without appearing itself to decide in favor of any one against the rest. The commentator here points out (at the end of the chapter) that the present rule presents the accepted doctrine of the treatise, the three that follow being dis-

37 *pāushkarasāder mate vyañjanaparah çakara sparçapūrvō
'pi chatvam nā "padyate çakārāpūrvō nakāraç ca ñakāram nā
"padyate yuthā' ād---- pāp---- pūrva ity ukte nakāra
iti katham labhyate ñakārāpattir asyān 've 'ti brāmah' prasak-
tasyān 'vā' hi' pratishedhāt⁴ vyañjanam asmāt param iti vy-
añjanaparah*

nān 'tat sūtradhvayam ishtam

¹ W om ² G M om *eva* ³ B O om ⁴ G M *dhah*

approved, but this does not satisfy us. We might, to be sure, regard ourselves as justified in assuming that the doctrine of the authors of the work is first stated, with due and respectful mention of the authorities upon whom they especially rely in maintaining it; but such an assumption does not in all cases help us out of the difficulty.

अविकृत एकेषाम् ॥ ३९ ॥

39 According to some authorities, it remains unchanged

That is to say, the authorities here referred to would read, for example, in one of the passages already quoted (vi 3 3¹), *arvāk hy enam*

As the euphonic treatment of *h* as a sonant instead of a surd letter is one of the most perplexing anomalies of the Sanskrit phonetic system, such indications as this of the fluctuating and antagonistic views of the old Hindu phonetists respecting it, and the willingness of some of them to give it the value of a surd in making combinations, are worth a great deal to us.

चतुर्थो ऽन्तरे शैत्यायनादीनाम् ॥ ४० ॥

40 According to Çātyāyana and others, a fourth mute is interposed

These respectable authorities would, if their views are not misrepresented, approve the very strange-looking and hardly defensible reading *arvākeḥ hy enam* (so writes W, with the utmost possible explicitness, B reads *arvāk hya hy*, O gives *arvākeḥ hy*, G M have *arvākeḥ*). The commentator tells us (one would like to know on what authority) that the "others" are Kāuhalīputra, Bharadvāja, Old Kāundinya, and Pāushkaiasādi. All are mentioned elsewhere (see Index) in the text itself.

38 *plākshyprabhrtindm mate prathamapūrvo hakāras tasya prathamasya sasthanam caturtham bhagate yathā' arv----- sarad----- tad----- evampūrva iti kim prat----- hakāra iti kim vāk----- va----- ā'ti----- prathamah pūrvo yasmād asāu prathamapūrvah*

¹ G M om

39 *ekeshām mate prathamapūrvo hakāro 'vikrto bhavati yathā arv-----*

40 *çātyāyanādīnām mate hakāraprathamayor antare madhye prathamāsasthānaḥ caturthāgamo bhavati yathā arv----- ādīcābdena kāuhalīputrabharadvājasthavirakaundinyapāushkarasādayo¹ grhyante*

¹ G M -ndinyānam, and then a lacuna to *pyartham* under the next rule

मीमांसकानां च मीमांसकानां च ॥४१॥

41 As also, according to the Mīmāṃsakas

The especial mention, in a separate rule, of the agreement of this school with the view of Āitiyāyana and his abettors, is made, says the commentary, with an honorific intent

He adds, as was above remarked, that rules 39 to 41 are disapproved

CHAPTER VI

CONTENTS 1-5, conversion of *s* and *h* into *sh*, 6-13, exceptions and counter-exceptions, 14, insertion of *s* between final *n* and initial *t*

अथ षकारं सकारविसर्जनीयौ ॥१॥

1 Now for the conversions of *s* and *visarjanīya* into *sh*

An introductory heading to the rules of this chapter—excepting the last rule

स्वानासोदिव्यापोक्ष्यमुकमूमोप्रोत्रीमह्यविपद्यवय- हपूर्वः ॥२॥

2 A *s* is converted into *sh* when preceded by *svānāso divi*, *āpo hi*, *ayam u*, *kam u*, *ū*, *mo*, *pro*, *trī*, *mah*, *dyavi*, *padi*, or a former member of a compound

The illustrative passages, as given by the commentator, are as follows *uta svānāso divi shantv agneh* (12 14⁷ only O has ^{*} *agneh*, B omits both that and the preceding word) with the

41 cakārah pūrvoktavīdhim anvādigaṇi mīmāṃsakaśāstram ca
'ntarāgamamatam sammatam pūrvoktam evo 'dāharanam
mīmāṃsakaśāstram¹ pūjārtham prthaksūtrārambhah
nār 'tat sūtratrayam ishtam

iti tribhāṣhyaratne pratīcākhyaṅgarane
pañcamo 'dhyāyah

¹ G M omit to here

1 *athe* 'ty *ayam adhikārah sakāravisanjanīyāu shakāram
āpadyete ity etad adhikṛtam vedītavayam ita utturam yad vak-
shyāmah.*

counter-example *trītiyaśyām ito divi somo āsit* (ii 5 7¹), to show the powerlessness of *divi* to effect the change except after *svānāsah*. Then *āpo hi śthā mayobhuvah* (iv 1 5¹ v 6 1⁴ vi 4 19⁴ only G M have the last word) the necessity of *āpo* is shown by the counter-example *na hi svah svān hinasti* (v 1 7¹). Next *ayam u shya pra devayuh* (ii 5 11¹), and *kam u shvid asya senayā* (ii 6 11²) with the counter-example *tad u soma āha* (iv 2 8¹), to prove that *u* changes *s* only after *ayam* and *kam*. For *ā*, the example is *ūrdhva ā shu na ūtaye* (iv 1 4² only G M have the first word) the other passages in which it exerts a like influence upon an initial *s* are i 5 11⁵ ii 5 10¹ iv 6 5⁶ v 1 5³ vii 1 18², 4 17². For *mo*, the only passage is the one quoted, *mo shā na indra* (i 8 3). For *pro*, only *pro shv asmā puroratham* (i 7 13⁵). For *trī*, only *trī śhadhasthā* (ii 4 11² and ii 2 11¹). For the three remaining words, also, the text affords only the single examples given by the commentator: *mahī śhad dyuman namah* (ii 2 8²), *ya upa dyavi śthā* (ii 4 14⁵), and *padī śhātām amuñcatā yayati āh* (iv 7 15⁷). G M omit the last word. To the prescription conveyed in the last item of the rule, which seems to demand that every *s* beginning in *pada*-text the latter member of a compound should be changed to *śh*, rule 7, below, makes the very important general exception "not after a consonant, or an *a*-vowel," it means, then, that *s* is so changed after the *i*, *u*, and *r*-vowels and the diphthongs. The commentator illustrates only one or two of the cases in which the conversion would be required: *hañsah gucishad vasuh* (iv 2 1⁵, p *guci-sat* only G M have the first word), *ayā vishthā janayan* (i 7 12², p *vi-sthāh* only G M have *ayā*), and *goshomam dvitīyam* (vii 4 11¹).

I have collected from the Sanhitā all the words coming under the operation of this part of the rule, concerning the initial *s* of the latter member of a compound (just about a hundred in number, and some of them of quite frequent occurrence), but I do not think the list worth the trouble of giving here. So far as regards the Pratiśākhya and its relation to them, the important point is to determine whether its rules and exceptions precisely cover them—and I have to say that I have not succeeded in discovering any want of exact adaptedness to them. There is a single participle, *anusthita*, whose unaltered *s* is unnoticed and unprovided for in the chapter, but it occurs only as final member of a compound, *vishnuvanusthitah* (ii 4 12^{3 4,5}, p *vishnu-anusthitah*), and so, not being itself separated into its constituents, is exempted from the action of the present rule.

2. ----- *ity evampūrvo 'vāgrahapūrvag ca sakārah śhakāram*
āpadyate yathā uta----- svānāsa' itī kim trt----- āpo
---- āpo itī kim na----- ayam----- kam----- ayaukam
itī kim tad----- ūrdh----- mo----- pro----- trī-----
mahī----- ya----- padī----- hañs----- ayā----- go-----
avagrahah pūrvo yasmād asāv avagrahapūrvah

¹ W B *svāna*

असदानासिञ्चश्च ॥ ३ ॥

3 Also *asadāma* and *asiñcan*

The “also” (*ca*) in this rule implies, the commentator says, that the words mentioned are preceded by an *avagraha*, according to the final specification of the preceding rule else such passages as *ayāyān gharṇam prā 'siñcan* (v 4 3²) would fall under the prescribed action. The examples are *yena kāmēna nyashadāme 'ti* (vii 5 2¹, p *ni-asadāma*), and *mitrāvaruṇābhyashāñcan* (i 8 11, p *abhi-asiñcan*). The rule is given, we are told, for the purpose of ordaining that, in the case of these two words, the conversion into *sh* after an *avagraha* takes place even notwithstanding the interposition of an *a*. Why not, then, puts in an objector, say “even when *a* interposes,” without specification of the words concerned? Because, is the reply, the rule would then apply to such cases as *hrtsvaso mayobhān* (iv 2 11³, p *hrtsu-asah*)

उपसर्गनिष्पूर्वे ऽनुदात्ते पदे ॥ ४ ॥

4. Also in an unaccented *pada*, when a preposition or *nis* precedes

This rule can apply only to unaccented verbal forms, since they alone can be technically *anudatta* throughout, having the *anudatta* sign written under every syllable. In any compound beginning with a preposition like *pāri*, for instance, having an acute on the first syllable and an enclitic *svārta* on the second, the syllables of the other member of the compound would not have the *anudatta* accent, but the *pracaya* such would fall under rule 2 of this chapter. The word *pada* in the rule, we are told, is intended to specify the text “a word which is *anudatta* throughout in the *pada*-text” is what the Pratiśākhya means—it being, in fact, impossible that any word should be so accented in *samhitā*-text.

The commentator's examples are, for prepositions, *agmann ūrjam itī pari śhrīcati* (v 4 4¹), *imam vi śhyāmi* (i 1 10² and iii 5 6¹), *sāmrāgyeṇā 'bhi śhrīcāmi* (i 7 10³ twice, and v 6 3³ but B O read *śhrīcati*, I presume by a copyist's blunder, as I find no such phrase in the text), *yagamāne prati śthāpayanti* (vi 1 4²), and *ni śhasāda dhrtavrato varuṇah* (i 8 16¹ only B O have *varuṇah*),

3 *asadāma asiñcan ity etayoh sakārah śhakāram¹ āpadyate yathā yena---- mitr---- cakāro² vagrahapārvatvānvādega-kaḥ² anvādeṇā 'nena³ kim aḥ---- avagrahapārvatve 'py⁴ akāreṇa vyaveta ity ayam ārambhah nanu lāghavād akāravya-veto 'pī 'ty etāvataḥ 'vā 'lam kanthoktyā kim ucyate hr̥t---- ity ādāu mā bhād itī*

¹ G M *śhatvam* ² W B and O p m om *pūva* ³ B O G M om ⁴ G M *sati*

for *ni*, *ni shtanāhi duritā* (iv 6 6⁷ all the manuscripts of the comment, along with my manuscript of the Sanhita, read thus, as required by ix 1 compare the similar cases noted under rule 13, below) A number of counter-examples are given, showing the effect of absence of any one of the conditions contained in the rule they are *sādane sīda sumudhe* (iv 3 1), *brhatah çarmanī syām* (iv 1 5¹), *vi simatah surucah* (iv 2 8² G M omits this example), and *abhi savanā pāhi* (i 4 10, 11)

The cases coming under this rule are not so numerous but that it may be worth while to report them Of verbal forms after *adhi* I have found none, after *abhi*, I have noted *abhi shyāna* (i 4 46³), and forms of *abhi shucāmi* (i 7 10³ et al) and *abhi shunomi* (iii 1 8²), after *prati*, forms of *prati shthāpayāmi* (i 7 5² et al), and *prati shthānti* (ii 2 12³), after *pari*, forms of *pari shucye* (iii 3 11¹ et al), and *pari shthāt* (i 7 13³), after *vi* (besides that quoted under rule 13, below), *vi shayanti* (vi 4 7²), and forms of *vi shyāmi* (iii 4 11⁶), after *ni* (besides the one under rule 13), *ni shāsāda* (i 8 16¹ et al), and forms of *ni shūdāmi* (iii 5 11⁴ et al) Such cases as *ni-shādāyati* (v 3 7²), where the preposition, losing its accent before the accented verbal form, is combined with the latter in the *pada*-text, belong under rule 2, above The same is the case with *vyātishayet* (vi 6 4² et al), where the verb has two prepositional prefixes, and is therefore written in combination with them (*vi-ātishayet*), and with altered sibilant But for this circumstance, we should require a separate and special treatment of the word, for *ati* is by this Prātiçākhyā (i 15) excluded from the list of *upasarga*, 'prepositions,' and so could not by the present rule cause the alteration of an initial *s* of a root *Anu* is also thus excluded, whence the passage *anu sthana* (v 6 1³) does not fall under the rule, and the retention of its dental sibilant needs no specific authorization It is the only case, so far as I have discovered, in which the restriction of the class of prepositions to half its usual number has any bearing upon the objects of this rule

रासःसप्तैःगिर्निर्विडुमीदुःपायुभिर्वैःसुमतिर्माकिरीयुरायुरा-
भिःसधिर्नकिस्त्कारपरो नित्यम् ॥ ५ ॥

5 Also the *visarjanīya*, when followed by *t*, of *agnih* preceded by *rāsah* or *sapte*, and of *nih*, *viduh*, *mīdruh*, *pāyubhih*,

4 *sarvānūdātte pade vartamanah sakāra upasargapūrvō nishpūrvō vā shatvam āpadyate yathā aṣm----- imam----- sām----- yaj----- ni --- etāny¹ upasargapūrvān² nishpūrvam api ni sh----- evampūrvā iti kim sad----- brh----- sarvānūdātta iti kim vi----- abhi----- pada iti kim kālārtham padakāle³ 'nūdātta ity arthah*

¹ G M etc ² G M rgā ³ W -kā a

veh, *sumatih*, *mākīh*, *īyuh*, *āyuh*, *ābhīh*, *sadhīh*, and *nakīh*, under all circumstances

This is, the commentator remarks, a rule establishing exceptions in advance to rule 2 of the ninth chapter, which would require in every case *s* instead of *sh*. The examples are for *agnīh*, *aviduṣh-tarāśah* *agnīsh tad viṣvam* (1114⁴) and *medhyaś ca sapte agnīsh tvā* (v 111¹), with a counter-example, *varshīshthe adhi nāke* 'gnis te tanuvam (118 only G M have the first two words), to show that *agnīh* becomes *agnis* after other words than the two specified in the rule. For *nīh*, *nīsh tapāmi goshtam* (1110¹). For *viduh*, *viduṣhtarāṇ sapema* (11512⁵, p *viduh-taram*), and also, in virtue of rule 152, *aviduṣhtarāśah* (1114⁴, p *aviduh tarāśah*) *viduṣhtarāh* occurs at 11611¹. For *mīdhuḥ*, *mīdhuṣhtama śvātama* (11510⁴, p *mīdhuḥ-tama*). For *pāyubhīh*, *pāyubhīsh tvāṇ śvebhīh* (1424) with the counter-example *tasmād āgvas tribhīsh tishthāṇis tishthati* (v 412¹ only G M have the first two words), to show that the quotation of *bhīh* (of *pāyu-bhīh*) alone as *nimitta* would not have answered the purpose. For *veh*, *goce vesh tvāṇ hi yavā* (11313⁵). For *sumatih*, *sumatish te astu bādhasva* (1445¹ only G M have the last word) and, to justify the text in quoting *sumatih* (p *su-matih*) in full, instead of *matih* simply, we receive an asserted quotation from "another text," *pramatis te devānām*. For *mākīh*, *mākīsh te vyathir ā dadharshīt* (1214²). For *īyuh*, *īyush te ye pūrvatarām apacyan* (1433). For *āyuh*, *āyush ta āyurdā agne* (11512¹ only G M have *agne*) we have *āyush te* again at 1314⁴. For *ābhīh*, *ābhīsh te adya gīrbhīh* (1144⁷ G M omit the last word). For *sadhīh*, *apsv agne sa-*

5 *rāśah*, *sapte* ¹*ity etābhyām viṣīshthe* ²*'gnir ity asmin* ³*grahane nīh*.....⁴*nakīh ity eteshu viśarjanīyas takāraparah shakāram* ⁵*āpadyate* ⁶*yathā avid*..... *medh*..... *etābhyām viṣīshthe itī kim varsh*..... *nīsh*..... *vid*..... *apy akārādī* (152) *itī vacandā aviduṣhtarāśa ity apy udāhara-*
nam mī..... *pāy*..... *pāy*⁵ *itī kim tasm*..... *goce*.....
sum..... *sv itī kim pram*..... *itī śākhāntare māk*.....
īyush..... *āyush*..... *ābhīsh*..... *apsv*..... *nakīsh*.....
nityaśabdah kimarthah rkārarephavati (v18) *avagrahah*
(v 9) *itī nīshedham* ⁶*vakshyati avidur* ⁷*ity atra viśarjanīyasyā*
⁸*vagrahasthatvāt śhatvqm na syāt tan mā bhād itī kanthoktir*
⁹*vidur ity asyā* ¹⁰*'va* ¹¹*na tv avidur ity asye* ¹²*'itī dāurbalyāt tat-*
samrakshandārtho nityaśabdah prayujyate

aghoshaparas tasya sasthānam (ix 2) *ity asya puras-*
tād apavādo 'yam

(1) (2) W transposes, breaking *mīdhuḥ* in the middle ³ G M *etasmīn* ⁴ G M *śhatvam* ⁵ W O *yur*, G M *-yubher*, B corrupt ⁶ G M *pratiśhedho* ⁷ G M *vid* ⁸ G M *ins api* ⁹ G M *ins śhatvam*

dhish tava (iv 2 3², 11³) And for *nakih*, *nakish tam ghnanti* (ii 1 11⁴) *nakish tam* is found also at i 8 22⁴

The final specification of the rule, *nyam*, 'under all circumstances,' is explained as intended to assure the inclusion in the rule of the word *avidushtarāsah* (i 1 14⁴), already quoted, which would otherwise be liable to exclusion by the operation of rules 8 and 9, below. The word *viduh* itself, we are told, is all right, because of its specific mention in the text, but a little additional force is needed to bring in *aviduh* as its hanger-on. The explanation is by no means of the most satisfactory character, but I have nothing to suggest in its place. We have already once (see note to iii.8) had a case arising under i 52 treated as demanding a special handling.

अथ न ॥ ६ ॥

6 Now for exceptions

An introductory heading, of force in the rules that follow (through rule 13)

अवर्णव्यञ्जनशकुनिपल्युतुमृत्युमलिस्तुबृहस्पतिपूर्वः ॥ ७ ॥

7 Excepted is a *s* preceded by an *a*-vowel, a consonant, *çakuni*, *patni*, *rtu*, *mrtyu*, *malimu*, or *brhaspati*

The bearing of the first two items of this rule on those which precede it has been noticed under rule 2. The commentator's examples are, for a preceding *a*-vowel, *antarikshasad dhotā* (i 8 15² et al. only G M have the second word) and *ā sñcasva* (i 4 19 but G M omit the passage), of which one falls as an exception under rule 2, the other under rule 4, and, for a preceding consonant, *rksāme vā* (vi 1 3¹). Then, for the words specified, we have *çakunīśādena* (v 7 14), *patnisamyāñām* (ii 6 10⁴ G M read *-yāñāh*, which is found twice in the same division of the same section, but not elsewhere), *rtusthās tasya* (v 7 6⁶ the same compound is found at v 5 8¹), *mrtysamyuta va* (i 5 9⁴ only G M have *va*), *nā*

6 *athe 'ty ayam adhikārah ne 'ty etad' adhikṛtam vedītavyam ita uttaram yad vakshyāmah*²

¹ G M om ² W *vadāyāmah*

7 *avarnapūrvo vyañjanapūrvāḥ ca çakuni----- brhaspati
ty¹ evampūrvāḥ ca² sakārah shakāram³ nā "padyate yathā
ant----- avagrahapūrvatvāt⁴ prāptih⁵ 'ā sñ----- upasarga-
pūrvatvāt prāptih⁵ rk----- çak----- patn----- rtu-----
mrt----- nāi----- brh----- 'avagrahapūrvatvāt eśhām prāp-
tih⁶*

¹ O om ² G M om ³ G M *shatvam* ⁴ G M ins *eśhām* ⁵ G M om
⁶ G M om, W adds *sa visasyah avagrahapūrvatvāt prāptih*

'nam malimbusenā vindati (vi 3 2⁶ only G M have the first two and the last words), and *brhaspatissutasya te* (1 4 27 and vi 5 8³), all of which, as the commentator points out, are cases falling under the last specification of rule 2, respecting the conversion of initial *s* of the latter member of a compound

सकाररेफवति ॥ ८ ॥

8 Also in a word containing *r* or *r*

The commentator gives one example of each case, the former constituting an exception under rule 4, the latter under the last specification of rule 2 *vi sryate śāntyaśi* (1 7 6⁷), and *tasmāt sa visrasyah* (vi 2 9⁴, 10⁷ only G M have *tasmāt*)

Of other words falling under this rule, I have noted *parisrutam* (1 8 21), *visarjanam* (1 1 5²), *bahusūvarī* (11 1 11⁴), and *gosatram* (vii 5 1¹). Compare the nearly corresponding rules of the other treatises, Rik Pr v 11, Vāj Pr 11 81, Ath Pī 11.102, 106

अवग्रहः ॥ ९ ॥

9 Also in the former member of a compound

We should expect the word *avagraha* in this rule to be put in the locative case, so as to accord in construction with the preceding rule, and I have translated it as a locative. Its being a nominative makes the commentator some trouble: he declares *avagraha* here equivalent to *avagrahastha*, 'standing in *avagraha*,' and quotes as corresponding and customary expressions "the stages cry out," "the fat one knows," where "those occupying the stages," "the soul inhabiting a fat body," are really meant.

The occasion for such a precept as this arises out of rule 4, above, which provides for the conversion into *śh* of the initial *s* of a word wholly *anudātta*, after a preposition. It was aimed, as is there pointed out, at unaccented verbal forms. But the former members of compounds which are accented on the latter member

8 *rkāraṣ ca repaṣ ca rkārarephāu tāv asmint sta ity rkāra-rephavat tasmīn pade vartamānaḥ sakārah śhakāraṇi¹ nā² pad-yate yathā³ vi---- ³*upasargapūrvatvāt prāptih³ tasm----*
⁴*avagrahapūrvatvāt prāptih⁴**

¹ G M *śhatvam* ² G M om ³ W B O om ⁴ W om

9 *avagrahasthaḥ sakārah śhakāraṇi¹ nā² pad-yate upasarga-pūrvac³ ca³ avagraha ity avagrahastho⁴ lakṣhyate⁵ mañcāh kro-ṣanti⁶ ity atra⁶ mañcāsthāh⁷ sthālo jānāti⁸ it⁸ sthāladehasthaḥ udāharaṇāni tasy----- mukh-----*

¹ G M *śhatvam* ² W *-va*, G M *visarjanavyaṣ* ³ W *sat* ⁴ G M change place with *avagraha* ⁵ B O *labhy-* ⁶ G M ins *yathā* ⁷ G M ins *yathā*
⁸ B O om *it*

would also come under the rule, as being *anuddatta* throughout, and also entitled to the designation *padā*, 'word,' equally with completely independent vocables hence the necessity of providing for their exclusion from its action The commentator illustrates with a couple of examples *tāsyām devā ādhi samvāsanti* (ii 5 1¹), and *mūkham yayānānābhi samvidānē* (v 1 11² only G M have the first word) W B O introduce a third, between the other two, namely *abhi sām agachantē* 'ti (ii 5 3⁷), but, as is shown by the accentuation and division, it does not fall under either the fourth rule or this, and has evidently come in by somebody's blunder

It is very possible that the Sanhitā contains other cases requiring the application of this rule, but if so, they have escaped my notice

सवस्थानम् ॥ १० ॥

10 Also in *sava* and *sthānam*

The cited passages are *agnisavaḥ cityaḥ* (v 6 1⁵), *anusavanam purodāṣān* (vi 5 11⁴ and vii 5 6⁴), *savanesavane 'bhi grhnāti* (vi 4 11⁴, 6 11³), *prasavāya sāvitraḥ* (vi 6 5² G M omit the last word, and the whole example is a blunder, since there is nowhere a rule requiring the lingualization of the sibilant in *prasavāya*), and *gachā gosthānam* (i 1 9^{1,2})

The word *sthānam* being cited with its special case-ending, the rule would not apply to such forms as *sthānah*, *sthānī*, which in fact occur in the compound *pratiṣṭhāna* (e g i 7 6⁶ ii 4 4¹), with their sibilant converted to *sh* *Suva*, however, having no case-ending, falls under rule 122, and is employed as "part of a word, in order to the inclusion of a variety of cases," as the comment duly points out, and as his selected examples illustrate

न धिपूर्वे ॥ ११ ॥

11 But not when *dhi* precedes

The examples are *adhishavanam asi* (i 1 5⁴ W omits this example), *adhishavane jhivā* (vi 2 11⁴), and *adhishthānam āra-*

10 *sava sthānam ity¹ etayoh sakārah shukānam² nā* "pad-yate save 'ti padāṅkadeco bahūpādānārthaḥ³ agn-... anus-
---- sav-... pras-... gacha-...

¹ G M om ² G M shatvam ³ B bahūnam padanam arthaḥ

11 *sava sthānam ity ayoh¹ sakāre² dhipūrve³ nishedho na prasaratī yathā adh-... adh-... adh-... dhi 'ty ayan varnah⁴ pūrvo yasmād asau dhipūrvah tasmīn*

¹ B G M etayoh ² G M sakārasya pūrva ³ G M put first ⁴ W om

bhanam (iv 6 2⁴) There are no other words illustrating the rule, although *adhishavana* occurs in one or two other passages

Considering that an appended specification constituting a rule often applies only to the last word given in the preceding rule (e g iv 13, 16), it might well enough have seemed advisable to the authors of the Prātiśākhya to read here *dhupārvayoh*, in the dual, instead of *dhupārve*

संतानेभ्यःसप्ताभिःसंमितास्तनास्तीतस्त्वशःसक्सनि-
सनिःसनीःसभेयःसत्त्वासस्ययै ॥ १२ ॥

12 Also in *samtānebhyaḥ*, *saptābhiḥ*, *sammitām*, *stanām*, *śītam*, *spaṇah*, *sak*, *sam*, *sanīh*, *sanīh*, *sabheyah*, *sattvā*, and *sasyādyā*

The examples, as quoted by the commentator, are as follows For *samtānebhyaḥ*, *parisamtānebhyaḥ svāhā* (vii 4 21) For *saptābhiḥ*, *trisaptābhiḥ paṇukāmasya* (v 2 6² G M have only the first word) For *sammitām*, *vedisammitām minoti* (v 6 8²) For *stanām*, *dvistanām karoti* (v 1 6⁴) For *śītam*, *anusītam vapati* (v 2 5⁵) For *spaṇah*, *tanūpānah pratispaṇah* (v 7 3¹) *Sak* is declared a part of a word, implying a variety of forms, for example, *paṇcāt prṇisaktho bhavati* (ii 1 3³), *prṇisakthās trayo hāri-mantikāh* (v 6 23 G M omit the last word), *prṇisaktham ālabheta grāmahāmāh* (ii 1 3² G M O omit the last word), and *prṇisakthāya svāhā* (vii 3 18) I have noted no other cases, and should regard *sakthā* as (by 1 22) the preferable form for the *grahana* in the rule For *sam*, *tasmād etad gosam* (vii 5 2²), for *sanīh*, *asī stanayitnusanir asī* (iv 4 6² G M omit the first word), for *sanīh*, *vrshṭisanir upa dadhāti* (v 3 1³, 10¹) *gosamīh* is found also at iii 2 5⁷, and *vrshṭisanīh* at iv 4 6² As it would satisfy all these cases to cite *san* alone, in the character of part of a word (like *sak*, above), the commentator inquires why that was not done, and the citation of whole words avoided, and he brings up in reply *mrđhā vā esho 'bhishanno yasmāt samāneshv anyah greyān uta* (ii 4 2³ all but W stop at *-shanno*), and *nishannāya svāhā*

12 ----- *eteshu*¹ *sakārah* *shakāram*² *nā* "padyate yathā
pari----- *tri*----- *vedi*----- *dvi*----- *anu*----- *tan*-----
sag *iti paddikadeṣo bahūpādānārthah yathā paṇc*----- *prṇ*-----
----- *prṇ*----- *prṇ*----- *tas*----- *asī*----- *vrsh*----- "sann
*ity*³ *etāvataḥ 'vā*⁴ *siddhe kim akhlapadapāthena*⁵ *mrđhā*-----
nish----- *ity addu mā bhūd* *iti sus*----- *abhis*----- *sus*-----
----- "sattvāsamitānebhya *ity etayor upasargapūrvatvāt prāptih* "
*'sarveshām*⁶ *anyeshām avagrahapūrvatvāt prāptih*⁷.

¹ G M *eshu* ² G M *shakāram* ³ W B O *san* *ity*, G M *sam* *'ity* ⁴ G M
om *eva* ⁵ G M om *pada* ⁶ W *sattvāsasyādyā* *ity anyor upasargavagrahapūrv-*
B O *samtānebhyaḥ svāhā* *ity etayor up* ⁷ W om ⁸ G M om

(VII.1 19¹), as examples of the alteration of *san*. *San* would not cover all the cases, and the treatise makes no provision for the citation of a theme ending in *i*, or any other vowel than *a*, as representative of all the forms derived from that theme. For *śābheyah* is quoted *susabheyo ya evam* (VII.1 8¹ G M omit *evam*). For *sattvā*, *abhisattvā sahojāh* (IV.6 4² all the MSS read everywhere, in text, commentary, and *Sanhitā*, *satvā*). And for *susyāyā*, *susasyāyā supippalābhyah* (I.2 2³).

All these are exceptions under rule 2, being cases of compounds whose second member begins with *s*, after a vowel other than an *a*-vowel. The commentary tries (with much discordance between the different manuscripts—see the various readings below) to claim two of them as exceptions under rule 4, but there is no ground for so doing.

न स्वरस्पर्धास्त्रीमसाहस्रसारथिस्फुरन्तीस्तुब्ध्याति- रायुश्चतुःपूर्वस्तो ॥ १३ ॥

13 But not in *svara*, *spardhāh*, *starīma*, *sāhasra*, *sārathih*, *sphurantī*, *stubh*, and in *sto* when preceded by *jyotih*, *āyuh*, or *catuh*.

Of these words, the first six constitute counter-exceptions under rule 8, which excepted words containing *r* or *r* from the conversion of their initial *s* into *śh*. The examples, as quoted by the commentator, are as follows: *ambā nī śhvara* (I.4 1² and VI.4 4³), *vi śhpardhāś chandah* (IV.3 12³)—these two, it is noted, are cases under rule 4, of unaccented verbal forms after a preposition—*śu-śhtasīmā jushānā* (V.1 11²), *dvishāhasram cinvīta* (V.6 8² G M omit *cinvīta*), and *trishāhasro vā asāu lokah* (V.6 8³ G M. omit after *vā*)—both forms are, we are made to observe, included in the citation of *sāhasra* by its theme-ending *a*, according to rule 1.22 other forms do not occur in the *Sanhitā*, nor these elsewhere than in the two divisions quoted from—*kāmayate sushārathih* (IV.6 6²), and *vishphurantī amitrān* (IV.6 6²).

The next case is a very anomalous one, being the conversion of *s* into *śh* after *a*, contrary to the first specification of rule 7. The phrase is *śashtup chandah* (IV.3 12², p. *sa-stup*). Compare similar cases as noted in *Ath Pr* II.95.

The combination of *sto* with the three words mentioned, although

13 ----- *stup ity eteshu sakārah jyotih āyuh catuh evampūrvag ca¹ sto ity atra sakāra rīkārarephavati* (VI.8) *avarṇavyaṅjana* (IV.7) ²*iti co 'ktam² nishedham nā³ padyate kim tu śhatvam pratipadyate iti pratiprasavārtho 'yam nakārah yathā. ambā---- vi śh---- upasargapūrvatvād anayoh prāptih susht---- grahanasya ca³ (122) iti vacanād akāragrhitam⁴ 'sāhasragrahanam anekārtham yathā⁴ dvish----*

not quite regular, has nothing strange in it. The final *visarjanīya* of the first member of the compound is lost by ix 1, and the sibilant is treated as it would be had no *h* been present. The examples are *jyotishtomam prathamam* (vii 4 10¹, 11¹), *āyushtomam trītiyam* (vii 4 11¹), and *catushtomo abhavat* (iv 3 11²). *jyotishtoma* and *catushtoma* occur in a number of other passages, which it is not worth while here to rehearse. The exception this time is to the second specification of rule 7, according to which the consonant *h* at the end of the former member of the compound would prevent the lingualization of the sibilant. Of course, according to the theory of the Prāticākhya (by v 3), the lingualization is first performed, giving *jyotihshtoma* etc., and then, by ix 1, the *visarjanīya* disappears, making *jyotishtoma*, as all the manuscripts, of comment and Sanhitā, constantly read.

The commentator remarks the fact that, from *starīma* on, the cases are such as fall under the last specification of the second rule of this chapter. He then adds, as counter-examples under *sto*, *yad akshnayāstomīyāh* (v 3 3¹), *catushtomam karoti* (v 1 6⁴), and *jyotis tv 'ā asya* (ii 2 4⁸) but G M omit this example.

There are a few other words which we might expect to see included among those forming the subject of this rule. Such is *barhshud* (iv 6 1⁴ et al.), i e *barhsh-sad* but the Rik and Atharvan *pada*-texts adopt the omission of the final *h* as part of their own reading, and the Tāttirīya (p *barhsh-sad*) does the same, so that the irregularity of the word lies outside the Prāticākhya. Such, again, are *duštara* (iv 4 12²) and *duštariṭu* (iv 4 12¹); provided that, as seems to me probable (compare note to Ath Pr ii 85), they are regarded as compounds of *duh* with *stara* and *starīṭu*. But these words are written by the *pada*-texts of the other Vedas *du stara* and *dustariṭu*, and the *pada*-text of the Tāttirīya-Sanhitā reads *duštara* and *duštariṭu*, so that there is no reason for their peculiar phonetic form being noticed by the Prāticākhya. Once more, *trishshamrddhatvāya* (ii 4 11⁵) would call for inclusion here, but that the addition of the suffix *tva* at its end annuls the separation which would otherwise be made of the first element of the compound, *trih*, and the word stands in *pada*-text *trishshamrddhatvāya*, and so does not require alteration in *sanhitā*.

तर्हस्तस्मिंलोकान्विदास्तास्त्रिन्युष्मानूर्ध्वानम्बका-
नृतूनश्मन्कृष्वन्यितूननान्कपालास्तिष्ठन्नाद्युदात्तेनेमि-

*trish-... kām-... vish-... sash-... jyot-... āy-
... cat-... sturimādīnām eshām avagāhāpūrvatvāt prāptih
jyotirādīpūrvatvena kim yad-... sto iti kim cat-... jyot-
---*

¹ G M om ² G M *vy āh* ³ W B om ⁴ W B O om

देवात्सवनेपशूस्तकारपरः सकारं प्राकृतो नित्ये प्रा-
कृतो नित्ये ॥ १४ ॥

14 In *tarhān*, *tasman*, *lokān*, *vidvān*, *tān*, *trīn*, *yushmān*, *ūrdhvān*, *ambakān*, *rtūn*, *açman*, *krnvan*, *pitṛn*, *anān*, *kapālān*, *tishthan* when accented on the first syllable, *nemur devān*, and *savane paçūn*, an original *n*, followed by a *t*, becomes *s*, when the *t* is a constant one

There seems to be no particular reason why this rule is introduced here, instead of anywhere else in the work, as it has no relation with the rest of the contents of the chapter. It is a complete rehearsal of the cases in which the old *s*, with which most Sanskrit words in *n* originally ended, is retained under the protection of a following initial *t*. The combination, of course, is historically identical with that of *n c* into *ñcc*, treated of in the preceding chapter (v 20 see the note upon that rule). The "conversion" of *n* into *s*, as the treatise chooses to state the case, involves, by xv 1-3, the prefixion of *anusvāra* to the sibilant.

The examples quoted by the commentator are as follows. For *tarhān*, *catatarhāñs trñhanti* (i 5 7⁶ and v 4 7⁴). For *tasmin*, *tasmñs tvā dadhām* (i 6 5¹, 7 5¹). For *lokān*, *imān eva lokāñs tīr tvā* (iii 5 4³) there is another case of *lokāñs* at ii 3 6¹. For *vidvān*, *ya evam vidvāñs trandhātaviyena yajate* (ii 4 11⁴). G M stop with *-yena* the Tāttirīya-Saṁhitā has *paçukāmo* before *yajate*, which W B O have doubtless dropped out by an oversight. For *tān*, *kaksheshv aghāyavas tāñs te dadhām jambhayoh* (iv 1 10³ only G M have the first two words, and they omit the last one) *tāñs* is also found at ii 4 11⁴ iii 1 9⁵ iv 1 10² twice vi 3 1⁴ twice, 4 10^{3,4}. For *trīn*, *trīñs trodñ anu* (ii 5 10¹). For *yushmān*, *yushmāñs te 'nu* (iii 2 5⁶) we find *yushmāñs* again at vii 1 5². For *ūrdhvān*, *yān ūrdhvāñs tān upabdimatah* (iii 1 9¹ only G M have the first word). For *ambakān*, *tryambakāñs trītyasava nam akurvata* (iii 2 2³ G M omit the last word). For *rtūn*, *rtāñs tanvate kavayah prayānatih* (iv 3 11³ G M omit after *tanvate*). For *açman*, *açmāñs te kshut* (iv 6 1¹ and v 4 4¹). For *krnvan*, *punah krnvāñs tvā pitaram yuvānam* (iv 7 13³ only W has the last word). For *pitṛn*, *oja iti pitṛñs tantur iti* (v 3 6¹).

14 ----- ādyudātte tishthanagrahane----- eshv¹ grahaneshu
prākṛto nakārah padasamaye² vartamānas takāraparah sakāram
āpadyate yathā çat----- tasm----- imān----- ya-----
kaksh----- trīñs----- yush----- yān----- tryam----- rt-
----- açm----- punah----- oja----- prān----- api vikr-
tam (151) iti vacanād etad bhavati dvād----- tribh-----
• ādyudātta iti kim na----- apy akārād (152) iti prāptih
nem----- nemur iti kim jāt----- mādñ----- savanā iti kim

only G M have the first two words) For *anān*, *prānāṅs tasyā 'ntar yanti* (vii 1 3¹, p *pra-anān*) here rule 1 51 is invoked to show that the lingualized *n* does not render the citation inoperative. For *kapālān*, *dvādaśakapālāṅs trītyasavane* (vii 5 6⁴) For *tishthan*, *tribhis tishthaṅs tishthati* (v 4 12¹) as counter-example, proving the necessity of the requirement as to accent, we have *na praty atishthan tā vasuko 'si* (v 3 6³ G M omit *na*), which would fall under the operation of the present rule by 1 52. For *nemur devān*, *nemur devāṅs tvam paribhūr asi* (ii 5 9³ G M omit *asi*), with the counter-example *jātavedo vapayā gacha devān tvaṅ hi* (iii 1 4⁴ G M omit the first word), to show that *devān* is so treated only after *nemur*. For *savane paṣān*, *mādhyaṇdine savane paṣāṅs trītyasavane* (iii 2 9² G M omit the first word), with the counter-example *prayām paṣān tenā 'vardhata* (vii 4 3²), to prove the need of *savane* in the rule. Then, as general counter-example, to bring out the fact that *n* is thus converted into *s* only before *t*, we have *tasmin prayāpatir vāyuh* (vii 1 5¹) G M add also *lokān dravināvatah* (v 3 11²). And finally, the commentator proceeds to explain and illustrate the limitations "an original (*prākṛta*) *n*" and "a constant (*niṭya*) *t*," given in the rule. An original *n* is one which is not the product of euphonic processes, but is read in the *pada*-text in *tām tena gamayati* (v 7 3³), then, where the *m* represents a *n*, produced by the assimilation of *m* to the following *t* (by v 27), the rule has no force. A constant *t*, in like manner, is one which is found in all forms of the text, and not in *samhitā* alone hence, in *vidānt somena yagate* (iii 2 2³), the *t* which is introduced (by v 33) between *n* and *s* does not cause the conversion of the *n* into *s*. The *t* in this case, to be sure, is (by xiv 12) to be turned into *th* (and is so written in the citation by W G M), but, as the rules of the treatise (by v 3) have to be applied in their order, the danger of misapprehension upon the point in question requires to be guarded against for a *t* inserted by authority of the fifth chapter might assibulate a nasal according to the sixth, before it was itself turned into an innocuous *th* by the fourteenth.

The cases in which the insertion of *s* between *n* and *t* is made in the Tāttirīya-Saṅhitā are thus seen to number only thirty-one. On the other hand, the cases of the collision of *n* and *t* without interposition of *s* are very numerous. I have noted about two hundred

pray---- *takāropara iti 'kum tasmin----* *lokān----- prākṛta iti kum tām----- vākṛto⁴ 'yam nakāro⁵ makāra sparṣaparah* (v 27) *iti prāptatvāt niṭye takāra⁶ iti kum³ vidv----- anityo 'yam nakāro yatah padasamaye nā 'sti takārah paro yasmād asdu tathoktah⁷*

iti tribhāṣhyaratne prāticśākhyaivarane
śaṣtho 'dhyāyah

¹ B O *eteshu* ² G M *niṭye pade* ³ B om ⁴ G M *aprākṛto* ⁵ G M *ims*
yatah padasamaye nā 'sti ⁶ G M om ⁷ G M *takāraparah*

and eighty, and presume that I may have overlooked here and there others, so that there would be in all ten times as many instances of the omission as of the insertion. In the Atharva-Veda (see second marginal note to Ath Pr ii 26) the condition of things is quite different while the whole number of collisions is much less (only ninety-five), the sibilant is introduced in considerably more than two-thirds of them (in sixty-seven cases, against twenty-eight). The comparison is of some interest in its bearing upon the question of the relative age of the two texts

CHAPTER VII

CONTENTS 1-12, cases of the conversion of *n* into *n̄*, 13-14, of *t* and *th* into *t̄* and *th̄*, 15-16, exceptions to the conversion of *n* into *n̄*

अथ नकारो णकारम् ॥ १ ॥

1 Now for conversion of *n* into *n̄*

An introductory heading, stating the subject of the chapter (with the exception of rules 13 and 14). We have treated here all the cases with which the Prāṭigakhyā has properly to deal, as arising in the process of conversion of *pada*-text into *saṃhitā* chapter thirteen (rule 6 seq.) takes up the occurrence of *n* in a different way, determining every instance in which that letter is found in the whole Saṃhitā

पुष्कृधिसुवःसमिन्द्रास्यूर्युरुवाःषट्त्रियामनिषूर्वः ॥ २ ॥

2 *N* becomes *n̄* when preceded by *shu*, *shū*, *krdhī suvāh*, *sam indra*, *asthūri*, *uru*, *vāh*, *shat*, *tri*, *grāma*, or *nah*

The commentator's illustrative examples are as follows. For *shu*, *ūrdhva ū shu nah* (iv 14² and v 15³ O omits the first word), and, as counter-example, *grheshu nah* (ii 4 5¹), where *shu*, not being a complete word, does not (by 150) lingualize the nasal but G M omit this passage and the accompanying explanation. For *shū*, *mo shū na indra* (183). The commentator points out

1 *athe 'ty ayam adhikārah nakāro nakāram āpadyata ity etad adhikartam vedītavyam ita uttaram yad vakshyāmah*

2 ----- *evampūrvo nakāro nakāram āpadyate yathā' ūrdh----- 'grh----- ity atra natvam na bhavati padagra-
haneshu* (150) *iti vacanāt* ³ *mo----- susū* ³ *ity etayor yadā shatvam nā 'sti tadā natvanishedhārtham vākrtagrahanam ya-*

that *shu* and *shū* are cited in the rule in their altered form (not as *su* simply, which, by 1 51, would include them both) in order to indicate that where then consonant is not lingualized they do not lingualize the following nasal, and he quotes in illustration *su na ūtaye* (iv 1 4²) and *sū na indra* (1 8 3). Both these passages are the same which have been already quoted to illustrate the conversion, and G M O very properly put them into the form of another text (apparently a *kramā*), reading *su nah nu ūtaye*, and *sū nah na indra*. *Shu* converts *n* to *ṇ* also at iv 6 5⁶. For *krđhi suvah*, the passage is *brahmanā krđhi suvar na gukram* (ii 2 12⁶). O omits the first word the Calcutta edition has the false reading *na*), and the necessity of *krđhi* is shown by the counter-example *svāhā suvar nā 'rkah svāhā* (v 7 5²). O omits the first word). For *sam indra*, *sam indra no manasā* (1 4 44¹), and *vartaye 'ndra nardabuda* (iii 3 10¹) shows that *indra* when not preceded by *sam* does not exercise the prescribed influence. For *asthūri*, *asthūri no gārhapatyāni santu* (v 7 2¹ only O has *santu*). For *uru*, *uru nas krđhi* (ii 6 11³ and vi 3 2²) there is another like case at iv 7 14². For *vāh*, *tasmād vār nāma vo hitam* (v 6 1³ G M omit the last two words). For *shat*, *shannavatyāni svāhā* (vii 2 15). For *tri*, *trinava stoma vasūndam* (iv 3 9¹ G M O omit the last word) the word *trinava* is found in a considerable number of other passages. For *grāma*, W B give *grāmanī rājanyah* (ii 5 4⁴), but G M O have instead *grāmanīyam prā 'pnuvantri* (vii 4 5²) the word is found once more, at iv 4 3¹. For *nih*, *nir nenyati tato 'dhi* (vii 2 10² G M omit the last two words), and *ni no rayeni* (ii 2 12³) is added, to show that *ni*, without *visarganīya*, has no alterant force. *Nir nenakte* (vii 2 10⁴) and *nirny* (iv 6 8¹) are the only other cases I have noted for *nih*.

ह्रस्वाद्युपमानं च ॥३॥

3 Also in *hanyāt* and *upyamānam*

That is to say, after *nih*, the last of the words given in the preceding rule. The passages are *yoner garbham nir hanyāt* (v 6 9¹

thā su.... sū.... brah.... krđhi 'ti kim svāhā....
sam.... sam ti kim vart.... asth.... uru.... tas-
mād.... shan.... tri.... grām.... nir.... visargena
kim ni....

¹ G M om ² G M om ³ O *shushū*

3 *cakāro nishpūrvatvam anvādeṣati nihṣabdottarayor¹ hanyād upyamānam ity etayor grahanayor² nakāro nakāram³ āpad-yate yathā⁴ yon-.... nir-.... anvādeṣah kīmarthah na*

¹ G M -*bdayo 'ti*, O *nishpūrvayor* ² G M om ³ W *nakātvam*, B *natvam*
⁴ G M om

O omits the first word), and *nirūpyamānam abhi mant ayeta* (168³ O omits the last word) A counter-example, showing *hanyāt* without altered *n*, is *na n hanyān na lohitaṁ kuryāt* (116 10²)

पारीपरिपरीपूर्वः ॥४॥

4 Also after *pārī*, *pari*, *parī*, and *pīa*

The illustrative citations of the commentator are *pārīnahyasye* "ge (vi 2 1¹), *pari no rudrasya* (iv 5 10⁴), *vīravantam parīna-* *sam* (ii 2 12⁶), and *pra no devī sarasvatī* (18 22¹ O omits the last word) For *pārī* (p *pārī-nahyasya* compare iii 7) there is no other case, nor for *pari* (p *pari-nasam* compare iii 7), for *parī*, I find only *pari nayati* (ii 3 4³ et al) But for *pīa* the examples are quite numerous we have *pra nah* at 15 11⁴, 6 4³, 7 10² twice 11 5 12¹ iii 1 11², 3 11⁴ iv 2 6⁵ v 5 7⁵ vii.4 19⁴, *pra nāma-* *ni* at iv 3 13⁶, forms of *pra nuyāmi* at 16 8¹ et al, of *pīa nude* at ii 1 13⁵ et al, *pranūdyā* at 13 5, *pranīyamānah* at iv 4 9¹, *pra neneṭi* at vi 2 9¹, *pranī* at ii 5 9², *pranīti* at 14 18 and *su-* *pranīti* (but p *su-pranīti*) at 15 11⁵ et al, *pranēter* at iii 5 11³, and *pranava* at iii 2 9⁶ *Parānuttī* occurs only in composition (vi 2 3², p *bhrātrvya-parānuttī*)

अवर्णव्यवेतो ऽपि ॥५॥

5 And that, even when an *a* vowel intervenes

The word "even" (*api*) here brings down by implication, according to the commentator, the words in the preceding rule from *pari* on—that is to say, virtually, *pari* and *pra*, for there is no case of *pari* exercising such an effect The examples for *pari* are *agram pary anayat* (ii 3 4³ all but O omit *agram* I find besides only *pary anayan*, at vi 5 7²), and *paryānīyā "havanīyasya* (vii 1 6⁶) For *pīa*, we have *prānāya svāhā* (vi 1 19¹, p *pīa-anāya*), and *anu prā 'nyāt prathamām* (v 5 5², p *pre 'ti anyāt* only O has *anu*) The occurrence of *prāna* is very frequent of other cases, I have noted only *prā 'nudata* at vi 2 3², and *pīa 'nidanta* at vi 4 10³ ⁴—where, however, the lingualization of the *n* is suspended in our text, as at present constituted, by the intervention

4 ----- *evampūrvō nakāro nakānam āpadyate yathā¹ pārī-*
----- *pari----- vīr----- pra-----*

¹ G M O om

5 *apīṣabduh paryādy¹ anvādīṣati² paryādpūrvō³ nakāro*
avarnavyaveto 'pī natvam bhayate⁴ yathā⁵ agram----- parī-
----- *prān----- anu----- avarnavyaveta iti kim parī-----*
pra-----

¹ B *pār-* ² G M O *-ādīṣakah* ³ B *par-* ⁴ G M *apadyate* ⁵ G M O om

between the preposition and the verb of the pause which separates the third and fourth divisions of the section

A couple of counter-examples are given, to show us that the intervention of a letter of any other complexion than *a* prevents the change of nasal they are *pari minuyāt sapta* (v 2 6³ G M omit the last word), and *pramānāma vratāni* (i 1 14⁴)

वाहनउक्षमानोयानमयन्यवेनवच्च ॥ ६ ॥

6 Also in *vāhanah*, *uhyamānah*, *yānam*, *ayan*, *yavena*, and *van*

According to W B O, the *n* becomes *n* in these words "when they are preceded as implied by the word 'also' (*ca*)," the commentary failing to tell us what this implication is G M, however, confess that *pra* only is brought forward (from rule 4) which is a marked departure from the ordinary usage of the treatise, since in the intermediate rule *pra* and *pari* were both distinctly understood The commentator omits, not to say avoids, noticing the irregularity Perhaps he would be justified in claiming that *pari* and *pari* are never found preceding the words specified in the rule, and that therefore it makes no difference whether they be regarded as implied or not still, even that consideration would not wholly excuse the want of accuracy and consistency The examples are for *vāhanah*, *pruvāhano vahnah* (i 3 3, p *pra vāhanah*), to this, W adds a counter-example, to show that, after any other word than *pra*, *vāhanah* remains unchanged—namely *havyavāhanah svātro* 'si (i 3 3) B tries to do the same, but only succeeds in repeating one of the counter-examples of the last rule, *pari minuyāt* (v 2 6³), which is not at all in place here For *uhyamānah*, *prohyamāno* 'dhipatih (i 4 9, p *pra-uhyamānah*) For *yānam*, *prayānam anv anyā id yuyuh* (iv 1 1², p *pra-yānam* O omits the last three words, G M the last two) *Ayan* is declared a part of a word, including a number of cases, of which G M give only three, *tasmād ādityah prāyanīyah* (vi 1 5¹, p *pra-ayanīyah* O omits *tasmāt*), *prāyanīyam kāryam* (vi 1 5^{3,5}), and *prāyanam pratishthām* (i 6 11¹, p *pra-ayanam*), while W B O add two others, *prāyanīyasya puronuvākyaḥ* (vi 1 5⁵), and *prāyānīye* 'han (vii 2 8¹) There are a number of other passages for *prāyanīya*, and *prāyana* occurs again at i 6 11² and vii 1 13, besides its compounds,

6 ----- *eteshu*¹ *grahaneshu cakārākrṣhtapārveshu*² *nakāro natvam bhayate yathā prav*-----³ *'pre* 'ti *kim havy*-----⁴ *proh*----- *pray*----- *ayann iti paddikadego bahūpādānārthah tasm*----- *prāy*----- *prāy*-----⁵ *'prāy*----- *prāy*-----⁶ *pray*-----⁷ *'vann iti paddikadego bahūpādānārthah*⁸ *'yadī*-----⁹ *dhav*----- *anvādegena kim. asī*----- *uday*-----

¹ G M *eshu* ² G M *-ṣhtaprapūrvo* ³ G M *om*, O *om* the example
⁴ G M *uy adī* ⁵ G M O B *om* ⁶ O *om*

suprāyana (v 1 11², p *su-prāyanāh*) and *agnishthoma-prāyana* (vii 2 9¹, p *agnishthoma-prāyanāh*) For *yavena*, *payarena pañca* (iv 3 11², p *pra-yavena*) *Van*, again, is (by W alone) declared a part of a word, intended to include many cases only two are given, *yad vā tāvat pravanam* (ii 4 12¹), and *dhavanī-yāt pravanāṅ syāt* (vi 2 6⁴), nor have I found any other, except the compound *purastātpravanah* (v 3 1⁵, p *purastāt-pravanah*) Finally, we have a couple of counter-examples, showing the necessity of the implication from the preceding rule they are *asī havyavāhanah* (i 3 3), and *udayanam veda* (i 6 11²)

प्रापूर्वञ्च ॥ ७ ॥

7 As also, when preceded by *prā*

The “also” (*ca*) of this rule brings forward from the preceding rule only the word last mentioned there, namely *van* The example is *prāvanebhūh sayoshasah* (iv 2 4³, p *pra-vanebhūh* compare iii 5) I have noted no other case

इन्द्रोऽयजुःपूर्व एनकेन ॥ ८ ॥

8 Also *enam* and *kena*, when preceded respectively by *indrāh* and *ayajuh*

There is nothing in the rule meaning ‘respectively,’ and if *enam* were found anywhere in the text preceded by *ayajuh*, or *kena* by *indrāh*, their *n*’s would doubtless require lingualization yet the evident intent of the precept is as translated The passages are *indra enam prathamah* (iv 6 7¹), and *yad ayajushkena kriyate* (v 1 2¹, p *ayajuh-kena* G M O omit *yat*) I find no other cases falling under the rule there are, however, one or two other forms analogous with the latter of those here contemplated, which we might expect to find treated in the same way, namely *andgīr-kena* and *sāgīrkena* (i 6 10⁴), but they are written by the *pada*-text without division of *gīrkena*, or restoration in it of the dental *n* (thus *andgīrkena*, and *sa-gīrkena*)

Counter-examples are added to show that *enam* and *kena*, when otherwise preceded, retain their dental nasals, *rudra enam bhātīvā* (iii 4 10³), and *brahmavādīnah kena tad ayāmī ’ti* (vii 4 10² G M O end with *kena*), to show that *indrāh* does not exercise a lin-

7 *cakārārshste¹ vann iti grahane nakārāh pre ’ty evampūrvō natvam bhāyate yathā² prāv----*

¹ W B *shita*, O *cakaro ’nvādashito* ² G M om

8 *indrāh ayajuh pūrvayor¹ enam kena ity etayor nakāro natvam bhāyate yathā² indra---- yad---- evampūrvā iti kim rudra---- brah----- ’enamkene⁴ ’ti kim indro-----³*

¹ G M O *ity evampūrvā* ² G M O om ³ W om ⁴ B *kena*.

gualizing effect upon other words, *indro neshad ati* (v 7 2³ B omits *ati*, W omits the whole example)

नृश्रीपूर्वी मनाः ॥ १॥

9 Also *manāh*, when preceded by *nr* or *crī*

The examples are *nrmanā āgasram* (i 3 14⁵ and iv 2 2¹ W reads *yantrī* instead of *āgasram*, but doubtless by a copyist's blunder, for *nrmanā yantī* is not found in the *Sanhitā*), and *crīmanāh gatapayāh* (iv 6 3²), with the counter-example *sumanā upāgahī* (iii 3 11⁵). Of *crīmanāh* I find no other example, *nrmanāh* occurs also at iv 2 2¹ (a second time) and vii 1 12

अङ्गानामोनेगानिगानांग्यानियामेन ॥ १० ॥

10 Also *aṅgānām*, *one*, *gānī*, *gānām*, *gyānī*, and *yāmena*

These words in *sanhitā*, says the commentator that is to say, in the only cases in which they occur as *padas*, they take *n* in the combined text. The passages are *yat tryaṅgānām samavadyati* (vi 3 10⁶, p *tri-aṅgānām* only G M O have *yat*, and O omits the last word), *āyushī dū one* (i 2 14³, p *dūh-one* the *padī*-texts of the Rik and Atharvan do not separate this word), *ati durgānī vīgvā* (i 1 14⁴, p *dūh-gānī*, like the other Vedas), *purogānām cakshushe* (iii 2 4⁴, p *purah-gānām*), *svargyāny āsun* (v 3 5³, p *svah-gyānī*), and *antaryāmenā 'ntar adhatta* (vi 4 6¹, p *antah-yāmena* O omits the last word). I have found no second example for any of these words, although there may be occurrences of *durone* which I have overlooked.

रषपूर्वी हवन्यक्केहन् ॥ ११ ॥

11 Also *havanī*, *ahne*, *han*, when preceded by *r* or *shah*

The cited examples are *agnihotrahavanī ca* (i 6 8³, p *agnihotra-havanī*), *śanady apas ahne* (ii 1 2⁵, p *apas-a-ahne* the Atharvan has *apas-a-ahnah*), and further, for *han*, which is declared to be a part of a word, involving several cases, *rakshohanam* (i 2 14⁶ et al, p *rakshah-hanam* O omits this example), *vāsh-*

9 *nr grī ity¹ evampūro manā ity ati a nakdro natvam bhagate yathā² nr m----- grī m----- evampūva iti kim sum-----*

¹ G M om. ² G M om

10 ----- *eteshu¹ nakāh samhitāyām natvam bhagate yathā² yat----- āy----- ati----- puro----- sv----- antary-----*

¹ G M O *eshu* ² W G M O om

navi rakshohanānu (i 3 2² G M omit the first word), and *vrtrahanam puramādam* (iii 5 11⁴ and iv 13³, p *vrtra-hanam* G M omit the last word) For *han*, besides the compounds here quoted, which are found repeatedly in other passages, the Sanhita affords us also *avirahanānu* (i 2 8², p *avira-hanānu*), for the other two words I know of no additional examples Counter-examples are given, namely *sāhna evā'smānu* (vi 6 11⁴, p *sa-ahne*), and *valagahanah* (i 3 2¹ et al)

There is good ground for questioning the correctness of the commentator's interpretation of *ra* in the rule as signifying the letter *r* (*repha*), and not the syllable *ra* In none of the examples given are the words specified directly preceded by *r*, and it is not at all in accordance with the usage of the treatise to describe as "having *r* before it" a word preceded by another word containing *r* All the versions of the comment, however, unite in this interpretation, and it is farther assured by the quotation of the rule above, under 119, as a case in which *r* is called *ra*, instead of *repha* It looks as if G M had made a blundering attempt to remedy the difficulty by reading the third word *ahan* instead of *han*, and also by understanding *shah* to mean 'the letter *sh*' (see the various readings, below), thus parallelizing the two specifications The attempt, however, is an abortive one, only issuing, if carried out, in a host of new difficulties I have made the translation of the rule conform to the requirements of the comment, but with much misgiving, having hardly a doubt that the meaning properly is 'when preceded by *ra* or *shah*'

रूपवो मयान्यनी ॥ १२ ॥

12 Also *mayāni* and *anī*, when preceded by *ru*

The passages are *dārumayāni pātrāni* (vi 4 7³, p *dāru-mayāni* O omits *pātrāni*, G M omit the whole example), and *tve vasāni purvanika hotah* (i 3 14^{2 3}, p *puru-anika* O omits the first two words, G M the last) *purvanika* is found also at

11 *havanī¹ ahne han² eshu³ grahaneshu nakāro rephapūrvah 'sha ity' evampūrvō⁵ vā natvam bhayate yathā agnīh-
---- gar- ---- hann⁶ iti padākadeco bahūpādānārīhah ra-
ksh- ---- vāish- ---- vrtr- ---- evampūrvā iti kim sāhna
---- val-*

¹ W O *havanī* ² G M *ahan* ³ W *evam* ⁽⁴⁾ G M *shakāra* ⁵ W B *ekamp-*, G M *purvo* ⁶ G M *ahann*

12 *mayāni anī¹ ity atra rūpūrvō nakāro² natvam bhayate yathā³ 'dārum- ---- 'tve- ---- evampūrvā iti kim yāni- ---- agnaye- ---- repahagrahanena kim svan-*

¹ W O *anī*, as also (with T) in rule, G M *anika*, as also in rule ² G M O put after *atra* ³ W G M om ⁽⁴⁾ G M om

iv 4 4⁵ As counter-examples are given *yāni mrnmayāni sākshāt tāni* (vi 4 7³ B omits the last word, G M O the last two), *agnaye 'nikavate* (i 8 4¹ et al), and *svanikasamdrk* (iv 3 13¹)

वाधापूर्वस्तष्टम् ॥ १३ ॥

13 After *vāghā* and *sh*, *t* is changed to *t*

The passage for *vāghā* is given by O as *dārvāghātas te* (v 5 15¹), all the other MSS have only the first word, in its complete *pada*-form, *dārvāghāta iti dāru-āghātaḥ*. The same word forms the subject of Vāj Pr iii 47. As counter-example, showing that *ta* does not become *ta* after *ghā* except when the latter follows *vā*, we have *praghāta ādityānām* (vi 1 13⁴). For the conversion of *t* to *t* after *sh* is quoted *āyush ta āyurdā agne* (ii 5 12¹ G M omit the last word, O the last two), whose *sh* depends on rule vi 5, above. O adds a counter-example for this second part of the rule also, namely *agnis te tejah* (i 1 10³ and vii 5 17).

यश्च ठम् ॥ १४ ॥

14 Also *th* to *th*

The cited example is *goshtham nā nirmrksham* (i 1 10¹ W B omit the last word), to which O alone adds *prati shthāpayanti* (vi 1 4²). As counter-example is given *gacha goshthānam* (i 1 9^{1,2})

न तकारपरः ॥ १५ ॥

15 But not when *t* follows

The commentator explains the connection of this rule by pointing out that the two preceding do not come under the introductory heading of the chapter—that is to say, that they deal with a subject unconnected with the rest of its contents—and that hence they are regarded as dropped out, and the present exception does not apply to them, but to the foregoing rules, for conversion of *n* into *n*. This is well enough, though not a little awkward, as concerns the status of rule 15, but we should like to hear what he had to say in defense of the intrusion of rules 13 and 14 thus into

13 *vāghā ity evampūrvah shukārapūrvag¹ ca takārash takāram bhagate² yathā³ dārv----- āyush----- ve⁴ 'ti kim pragh-----* ¹shapūrvā iti kim ²agnis-----³

¹ G M om, O om *kāru* ² O *āpadyate* ³ W G M om ⁴ W *vaghā*, B *vāghāta* ⁵ Only in O

14 *cakārah shapūrvatvākarshakah¹ thakārah shakā apūrvash² thakāram bhagate yathā gosh-----* ²prati-----³ *evampūrvā⁴ iti kim gacha-----*

¹ G M *shakārap-*, O *tvādeśakah* ² O om *kara* ³ Only in O ⁴ O *shap-*

a chapter where they do not belong, and where they sorely disturb the natural and desirable connection. Considering their near relation to the rules of the preceding chapter, they might better have been added there as an appendix, or else put at the head of chapter vii, before its general *adhikāra*.

Only a single illustrative example is quoted, namely *pari antarikṣhāt* (iii 1 10³), where rules 4 and 5 of this chapter combined would require *an* at the beginning of the second word, but for the exception here made.

This precept is an anticipation of one of the items of xiii 15, below, and might properly enough be looked upon as open to the charge of *punarukti*, or unnecessary repetition, which the treatise so carefully shuns, and the commentator not seldom labors hard to remove. It is characteristic of the method of the Tāttvīya Pratiśākhya that it does not attempt to state the real *numitta* or occasion of the lingual *n* in the words rehearsed here, although it does so, fully and distinctly, in rule xiii.6, where the subject of the occurrence of *n* in the interior of a word is taken up.

नक्षतिनूनंनृत्यत्यन्योन्याभिरन्यान्यत्तश्चात्तश्च ॥ १६ ॥

16 Nor in *nahyati*, *nūnam*, *nrtyanti*, *anyah*, *anyābhir*, *anyān*, nor when final.

The *ca* in this rule indicates the continuance of the exception. These words, and a final *n*, are not subject to the rules given in the chapter for the substitution of lingual *n*. The commentator quotes as follows. For *nahyati*, *vāsasā paryānahyati* (vi 1 11², p. *pari-ānahyati*. O omits the first word) he notes that the case constitutes an exception to rule 5. For *nūnam*, *prā nūnam pārnavandhuraḥ* (i 8 5¹. O omits the last word). For *nrtyanti*, *pari nrtyanti* (vii 5 10). For the three cases of *anyah*, *prā 'nyah gaṇṣati* (vii.5 9³), *prā 'nyābhir yachaty anv anyāḥ mantayate* (v 1 6⁴. O omits *prā* in all these three examples, and in this, along with G. M., the last three words, B omits the last word), and *prā 'nyān pātrān* (vi 5 11^{1,2}) the commentator remarks that all these (since *nahyati*) are cases of exceptions under rule 4. He then proceeds to raise the question why the three complete words

15 *vāghāśhādvidhir¹ anadhikṛtiatvād utpannapradhvansī tasmād at² nā 'yam nishedhah³ 'kim tu⁴ prakṛto⁵ natvavdhir anena vishayikriyate takāraparo nakāro natvam nā 'padyate yathā pary---- pārīparīparīprapārvaḥ* (vii.4) *avar-navyaveto 'pi* (vii 5) *ity etābhyām⁶ prāptih*

¹ W O *vāghāśh* ² G M *tatra* ³ B *vṛṣeshah* ⁴ O om ⁵ W O *prāh* ⁶ W B *etābhyām*

16 *nishedhākarsahakaḥ cakārah¹ ----- eshu² grahaneshu nakārah padāntaḥ ca³ natvam na bhagat⁴ yathā⁵ vās---- avar-navyaveto 'pi* (vii 5) *iti prāptih prā---- pari---- prā*

are quoted in the rule, instead of the syllable *an*, which would include them all, and makes the very obvious answer, that it is on account of the passage *anu prā'nyāt prathamām* (v 5 5²), already quoted under vii 5. Finally, as example of final *n* exempt from conversion, he cites *vrtrahañ chāra vidvān* (i 4 42), remarking that it is a case otherwise falling under rule 11.

The exception of a final *n* from becoming *ṇ* is also one of those made below, in rule xiii 15, for the class of cases to which that chapter relates.

I have not discovered in the Sanhitā any case of a lingual nasal arising in the conversion of *pada*-text into *samhitā* which is not duly provided for in this chapter.

CHAPTER VIII

CONTENTS 1-4, conversion of a final surd mute to sonant or nasal, 5-7, of *h* to *r*, 8-15, conversions of *h* to *r* after *a* and *ā*, 16-22, treatment of *h* before *r*, 23-35, conversion of *h* to *s* or *śh* before *k*, *kḥ*, or *p*.

अथ प्रथमः ॥ १ ॥

1 Now for changes of first mutes

That is to say, of surds unaspirated, or *k*, *c* (only *c* nowhere occurs as a final), *t*, *ṭ*, and *p*. The force of this heading only reaches, as the commentary points out, through rule 4—hardly far enough, one would think, to make a separate introductory rule necessary.

---- *prā* -- *prā*---- *pārīpaiṇiparīprapūrvaḥ*⁸ (vii 4)
*ity eśhām*⁷ *prāptih* *anu ity etāvātā*⁸ *siddhe* *'nyonyābhū anyānī* *'ti*
*kim pratipadapāthena*⁹ *anu*---- *ity atrā* *'nena*¹⁰ *nishedho*¹¹ *na*¹²
*piasarati*¹³ *'padānto* *nakāra* *nūtvam* *na bhayate* *yathā*¹⁴
vrti a---- *rashahpūi vah* (vii 11) *iti prāptih*

iti tribhāshyaratne prāticśākhyavivarane
saptamo 'dhyāyah

¹ B G M O put first ² B O *eteshu* ³ G M om, O adds *nakāro* ⁴ G M *apadyate* ⁵ G M O om ⁶ W B om *prapūi vah* ⁷ G M *etesham* ⁸ G M O *-vatai* *'va* ⁹ O puts before *kim* ¹⁰ O *nāi* *'sha* ¹¹ G M *praiśh* ¹² G M O ¹³ G M *-tv it* ¹⁴ B O om, G M *padāntaṣ ca*

1 *atḥe* *'ty* *'ayam adhikārah*¹ *prathama* *'ity etad*² *adhikṛtam* *vedatavyam ita uttaram yad vakshyāmah* ³ *visarjanīya* (viii 5) *paryanto*⁴ *'yam adhikārah*

(¹) W *adhikārārthah* (²) G M om (³) O ins *atha* (⁴) O *itistūtrapa-*

उत्तमपर उत्तमः सवर्गियम् ॥२॥

2 A first mute, followed by a last mute, becomes a last mute of its own series

The examples selected by the commentator to illustrate this mode of combination are *vān ma āsun* (v 5 9²), *shannavatyā svāhā* (vii 2 15), and *tan mahendrasya* (vi 5 5³). For the conversion of *p* into *m* he is able to offer no instance, as none occurs in the Sanhitā. As counter-examples, showing that only a nasal causes the conversion, and causes it only in a "first" mute, he brings up *vāk ta ā pyāyatām* (i 3 9¹ only G M have the last word), and *mām no vācam* (vi 4 7³).

All the Prātigākhyas join in treating this conversion as necessary, not as alternative with conversion into a sonant (see note to Ath Pr 11.5)

तृतीयः स्वरघोषवत्परः ॥३॥

3 Followed by a vowel or a sonant consonant, it becomes a third mute

The examples are *rdhag ayād rdhag uta* (1.4 44²), and *yad vā hotā* (iii 2 9¹)

ककुच्च मकारपरः ॥४॥

4 Also in *kakut*, when *m* follows

Namely, in the passage *kakudmān pratūrtir vāyasātamah* (i 7 7², *p kakut-mān* G M O omit the last word). As counter-examples are given *ya unmādyet* (iii 4 8⁴ G M O omit *yah*), and, according to W B, *kakut trayastriṅśah* (vii 2 5³), for which G M O substitute *kakuc chandah* (iv 3 12²). The commentator

2 *uttamaparah prathamah* ¹ *savargīyam uttamam āpadyate yathā*² *vān*---- *shan*---- *tan*---- *evampara iti kim vāk* ---- *prathama iti kim mām*---- *uttamah paro yasmād asāv uttamaparah*

¹ G M O ins *atmanah* ² G M om

3 *svanaghoshavatparah*¹ *prathamah savargīyam trītyam āpadyate yathā*² *rdhag*---- *yad*---- *ity ādi svarāḥ ca ghoshavantāḥ ca svaraghoshavantah te pare yasmād 'asāu*³ *sa ta thoktah*

¹ B om, G M O *svaraparo ghoshavatparaḥ ca* ² G M O om ³ G M om

4 *kakud ity asmin grahane 'ntyo varno*¹ *makāraparaḥ*² *cakā-rākrshtam savargīyam*³ *trītyam āpadyate*⁴ *yathā*⁵ *kakud*-----

notices, finally, that the present rule establishes an exception to rule 2 of this chapter

अथ विसर्जनीयः ॥ ५ ॥

5 Now for changes of *visarjanīya*

Departing a little from his stereotyped mode of explanation of *atha*, the commentary declares it in this rule to cause *visarjanīya* to be understood, in the character of that respecting which something is to be enjoined (*lakshya*), in the precepts that follow, and he adds that this understanding is to remain in force as far as rule 10 of the next chapter

रेफमेतेषु ॥ ६ ॥

6 *Visarjanīya* becomes *r* before the classes of sounds last mentioned

The examples are *tad agnir āha* (iv 2 8¹), and *āgā ma āryam* (iii 2 8⁵ O omits *āryam*), with the counter-example *agniḥ ca ma indraḥ ca me* (iv 7 6¹). The commentator points out that it is the plural form of the pronoun (*eteshu*, literally 'before those') in this rule that shows the implication of the vowels and sonant consonants, in the character of following causes (*pananimitta*), since those are the only things which have been mentioned above (namely, in rule 3). That is doubtless so, still, the reference must be regarded as an unusually blind one, involving a "frog-leap" (*mandākaphūti*) over two intervening obstacles, of which one is a general heading, that changes entirely the subject under treatment

*kakud iti kim ya---- evampara iti kim kakut---- makā-
rah paro yasmād asāu makāraparah uttamapara uttamāṇ
savargīyam* (viii 2) *ity asyā 'pavādo 'yam*

¹ G M *i'kāro* ² W *mākarah* ³ G M O put after *itriyam* ⁴ W *prāpyate*
⁵ G M om

5 *athagabdo visarjanīyam lakshyatvenā 'dhīkaroti 'ta uttam
yad ucyate' atha svaraparo yadāram* (iv 10) *ity avadhī-
bhūto 'yam adhikārah*

¹ G M *vaḥshyamah*

6 ¹ *svareṣhu ghoshavatsu ca² parato³ visarjanīyo repham āpad-
yate yathā⁴ tad---- āgā---- eteshv⁵ iti bahuvacanāntasya
sarvanāmno⁶ nirdeśāt svaraghoshavatām pananimittdānam upā-
dānam⁷ teshām eva p'akrtatvāt eteshu iti kim agniḥ----*

¹ G M, ms *eteshu* ² G M om ³ O *pareṣhu* ⁴ G M O om ⁵ W B *svare-
shu* ⁶ W O *sarvanāma*, B *nāmno* ⁷ G M *nat*

न रेफपरः ॥ ७ ॥

7 But not before r

R, though a sonant consonant, and therefore included in the preceding rule, requires a different treatment in the final *visarjanīya* before it. What this different treatment is, is pointed out farther on in the chapter (rule 16 seq.) The examples here given are *suvo rohāva* (179¹), and *ahorātre* (159⁷ et al. W O add *pārcve*, but there is no such collocation of words in the Saṁhita, and I suspect the word to be a corrupted reading for *prārciṣan*, which follows next at the place referred to)

ह्वारभार्वाह्वारबिभर्जीगरकरनन्तर्विवःसुवःपुनरहरहः-
प्रातर्वस्तःशमितःसवितःसनुतस्तनुतस्तोतर्हीतःपितर्मा-
तर्गष्टरेष्टनेष्टस्वष्टः ॥ ८ ॥

8 *Visarjanīya* becomes r in *hvāh*, *abhāh*, *vāh*, *hāh*, *abībhah*, *ajīgah*, *akah*, *amantah*, *vvah*, *svah*, *punah*, *aharah*, *prātah*, *vastah*, *camitah*, *savitah*, *sanutah*, *stanutah*, *stotah*, *hotah*, *ptah*, *mātah*, *yashtah*, *eshtah*, *neshtah*, and *tvashtah*

With this rule begins the detail of the cases of an original r after a and ā, which is protected and brought to light by a following sonant letter, being treated in quite a different manner from an original s, although both r and s are represented, as finals, by the indifferent *visarjanīya*. The commentator points out at the end the rules to which these cases constitute exceptions, namely ix 7,9,10. His illustrative examples are as follows. For *hvāh*,

7 *rephaparo visarjanīyo repham nā* "padyate yathā¹ *suvo*
---- *ahor*----, *ghoshavattvād rephasya pūrvavīdhiprāptih*
rephah paro yasmād asdu rephaparah

¹ G M om

8 ¹----- *eteshu¹ visarjanīyo repham āpadyate svaraghoṣhavat-*
paraḥ² yathā³ mā---- *yonādv*---- *vār*---- *mā me*----
ab---- *oṣh*---- *dev*---- ⁵*karāvar anudātte padē⁴* (viii.9)
iti⁵ vakshyati tendā⁶ vāi⁶ tad⁷ api sīdhyati⁸ apy akārādi (152)
iti vacanāt iti cet māi⁹ vām anudātte kaṣṭhādi tad bhavati
idam tv anyasvarārtham iti⁹ yathā¹⁰ arvā---- ¹¹*ādyudāttas*
tv idam¹¹ yaṣṭā---- *antar anādyudātte* (viii.10) *iti vak-*
shyati tasmād ankārādi ca¹² (153) *iti vacanāt sīdhyati iti*
cet¹³ māi¹³ vām¹³ anādyudātte tad bhavati ādyudāttārtham¹⁴
¹⁵*idam grahanam¹⁵ ca*---- *svār*---- *punar*---- *ahar*----

according to W B, *mā hvār mtrasya* (11 4¹), but, according to G M O, *mā hvār vasāndam* (11 3) I have found the word only in these two sections For *abhāh*, *yonāv abhār ukhā* (1v 2 5²) For *vāh*, *vār nāma vo hitam* (v 6 1³) For *hāh*, *mā me pra hār asti vā idam* (11 4 12^{3,4} v 15 1^{1,2} only G M have the last two words) the word is found also at 11 4 12⁵, 5 2^{3,5} For *abibhah*, as the only passage where it occurs (11 5 1²) does not exhibit in *samhitā* the final *r*, we have the *jatā*-text quoted, namely *abibhas tam tam abibhar abibhas tam* *Ajigah*, for the same reason, is treated in the same way in W B O, namely *oshadhīr ajigar ajigar oshadhīr oshadhīr ajigah ajigar ity ajigah* (1v 6 7³), but G M read simply *oshadhīr ajigah* For *akah*, *devatrā 'kar ajakshūrena* (v 1 7⁴ G M omit the last word) it is found also at 13 14² twice, 5 2³ 11 4 9², 5 7¹ 11 1 10³, 4 10⁴ 1v 1 2⁴ v 2 1⁴, 8⁷ v 1 4 8¹ As for this *akah*, the commentator supposes the objection raised that rule 9, which teaches that *kah* and *āvah* change *h* to *r* in an unaccented word, combined with rule 152, which would extend the force of that rule to *kah* with *a* prefixed, is sufficient to cover the cases of its occurrence, without separate mention in the present rule, but he denies the pertinence of the objection, on the ground that the specification here made includes all instances of *akah*, without regard to their accentuation—for example, *ākah* at 1v 1 2⁴, which is accented on the first syllable, but exhibits *r* in its *jatā*-reading, *ārvā' 'kar ākar ārvā' 'rvā' 'kah* For *anantah*, *yajñaparusho 'nantari-tyāi* (v 2 5⁶) A precisely similar objection is suggested to this word also, on the ground of rules viii 10 and 153 combined, and it is similarly repelled, by reference to the difference of accent *ānantar* has the acute on the first syllable, which rule 10 forbids For *vivah* is given, again in *jatā*-text, *ca vivar vivah ca ca vivah vvar iti vivah* (1v 2 8², only O has the final repetition of *vivah* the Atharvan reads *vi vah*, as two separate words, in the corres-

---- *ahārahāi*¹⁸ (viii 13) *ity anāṅgyānto nishadhyate*¹⁷ *evam-rāpasya*¹⁸ *nā'yam nuyamah*¹⁸ *prātar*---- *doshā*----¹⁹ *ṛtañ*
----¹⁹ *deva*---- *ārāc*---- *stanutar*²⁰ *iti śākhāntare etañ*
---- *hotar*---- *marut*---- *prthivi*---- *agne*---- *aśīy'*
---- *neshtah*---- *givas*---- *svaraghoshavatpara iti kin*
ab---- *punas*---- *avarṇapūrvas tu lupyate* (ix 9) *iti*
*kvacīl lopapī āptih*²¹ *atha svarapā'o yakāram* (ix 10) *iti kva-*
cīd yatvaprapīti okāram ah sarvo 'kārapa' ah (ix 7) *iti*
*kvacīd otvaprapīti*²¹ *tā etāh pī āptih*²² *pratiśheddhun hvārābhār-*
ādīdrambhah

(1) O ---- *eshu*, G M *hvar abhar var hār ity adī* ² G M om *svara* ³ G M om ⁴ W om (5) G M *kar amuddātāvena* ⁶ O om *eva* ⁷ W *tad* ⁸ O puts after *vacanāt* ⁹ G M om, O *api* ¹⁰ G M O om (11) W *ādīyudātāsva-rarthah*, G M O *ayam* for *idam* ¹² O om (13) G M *na*, O om ¹⁴ B *ātām*, G M O *attas* (15) G M *tv aya* 11, O *tv ayam iti gr-* ¹⁶ G M add *suvar* ¹⁷ W *dhyeta*, G M *-shedhūti ity* (18) G M *ayan mshedhah* (19) B om. ²⁰ G M *san-* (21) O om ²² W G M O *pīti*

ponding passage, iv 1 1) For *surah*, *suvar* *asi* *suvar* *me* *yacha* (v 7 6² O omits the last word) the numerous passages in which this word occurs it would be quite useless to rehearse For *punar*, *punar* *āsadya* *sadanam* (iv 2 3³ O omits the last word) this, too, is of too frequent occurrence to be worth detailed reference For *ahan* *ahah*, *aharahar* *havrdhānām* (ii 5 6³) the same repetition of *ahah* is found further at i 5 9⁶ twice,⁷ ii 5 6⁶ In connection herewith is made the remark that *ahah* when not at the end of a separable compound is the subject of rule 13, below, but that that rule does not apply to a case like the one here in hand For *prātah*, *prātar* *upasadah* (vi 2 3³) *prātah* is found also at i 4 7 ii 1 2⁵, 5 6³ iii 1 7¹, 3 8⁴, 4 10¹ vi 4 2¹ For *vastah*, *doshā* *vastar* *dhyā* *vayam* (i 5 6², p *doshā* *vastah*) also at i 2 14⁴ For *gamutah*, *grāṇ* *havish* *gamutar* *iti* *trishatyāḥ* (vi 3 10¹ only G M have the first word, only O the last) For *savitah*, *deva* *savitā* *etat* *te* (iii 2 7¹) the word is found also in about a dozen other passages For *sanutah*, *ārāc* *cū* *dveshah* *sanutar* *yuyotu* (i 7 13⁵) For *stanutah* we are simply referred to "another text" (*śākhāntara*) but G M read *sanutar* and omit *stanutar* in the rule itself For *stotah*, *etaṇ* *stotar* *etena* (vii 4 20) For *hotah*, *hotar* *yavishtha* *sukrato* (i 2 14⁵ O omits the last word) also at i 3 14³, 6 2² iv 3 13² v 1 4⁵ vi 3 8², 4 3³ For *pitah*, resort is had to the *jatā*-reading, since the only passage (iii 3 9¹) in which the word occurs does not bring to view the *r* thus, *marutām* *pitah* *pitar* *marutām* *marutām* *pitah* For *mātah*, *prthivi* *mātā* *mā* *mā* *hñ* *sīh* (iii 3 2² O omits the last word) For *yashtah*, *agne* *yashtar* *idam* *namah* (i 1 12) For *eshtah*, again a *jatā*-reading, *agñy* *esh* *tar* *eshtar* *agñyā* *gñy* *eshtah* (i 2 11¹) its treatment before the word which follows it in *sannhitā* is the subject of rules 18–22 of this chapter, that of the preceding word, of x 14 For *neshtah*, once more the *jatā* is drawn upon, *neshtah* *patnīm* *patnīm* *neshtar* *neshtah* *patnīm* (vi 5 8⁶) For *vashtah*, finally, *grā* *vashtar* *ihā* "gah" (iii 1 11² O omits the last word) also at i 3 7¹, 10¹ iii 1 11¹ vi 3 6², 11²

The commentary adds a couple of counter-examples, illustrative of the fact that these words show their *r* only before a vowel or sonant consonant they are *abibhas* *tam* *bhūtāni* (ii 5 1²), and *pu* *nas* *te* *mā* *'shām* (iv 7 14³)

करावरनुदात्ते पदे ॥ १ ॥

9 Also in *kah* and *āvah*, in an unaccented word

The cited examples are *mūṭhyā* *kar* *bhāgadheyam* (i 3 7²), and

9 *kah* *āvah* *ity* *etayor* *visarjanīyāḥ* *padahāle* 'nudātte' *pade* *vartamānāḥ* *svaraghoshavatparo* *repham* *āpadyate* *yathā* *mith*---- *suruco*---- *anudātta* *iti* *kim* *ko*---- *'āvo*---- *evampara* *iti* *kim* *adhī*----

¹ G M *ta* ² G M om ³ O om

suruco vena āvah āvar ity āvah (iv 2 8² G M O omit *surucāh*) For *āvah* I find no other example, *lah* occurs further at 1 4 45¹ 11 2 12¹. As counter-examples, *kō 'syē* "gvanāh" (11 6 7¹), and *d'vo vā'jeshu yām jund'h* (1 3 13² G M omit the last two words, O omits the whole passage) show the necessity of the specification respecting accent, while *adhāpām akah samashtyāi* (vi 1 7⁶) shows that the *r* appears only before a sonant letter. This last example, it may be remarked, is brought under the action of the rule by 1 52 it would be an example also under the preceding rule, compare what is there said in connection with the cited word *akah*.

अन्तरनाद्युदात्ते ॥ १० ॥

10 Also in *antah*, except when accented on the first syllable,

The cited examples are *antār agne rucā' tvām* (iv 1 9³, 2 1⁵), *agnīm antār bharishyāntī* (iv 1 3² O omits the first word), and *antaryāmē maghavan* (vi 4 6³ but O omits the example—reasonably enough, since it is given again later in this very comment, in illustration of a special point) It were to no good end to rehearse the other cases of occurrence of so common a word. To show the necessity of the restriction respecting accent, the commentator quotes *eshō 'ntō 'ntam manushyāh* (vii 2 7²), where we have the noun *ānta*, which the rule was especially constructed to avoid including. To prove, again, the continued implication of "followed by a sonant letter," is given *antās te dadhāmi* (1 4 3 and vi 4 6^{1 2}). Then the comment proceeds to justify the form in which the restriction respecting accent is made in the rule it might have been said, "when accented on the last syllable," but then the rule would have applied only under those circumstances, whereas now is included the case when the word is not accented at all, as in *antarvedī mathund'u* (vii 5 9⁴, p *antah-vedī*) and *antaryāmē maghavan* (vi 4 6³, as above but G M omit). The mode of statement selected, however, it may be remarked, has this inconvenience—that it renders necessary the separate specification, in rule 8, of *anantah*, because that combination, where it occurs, happens to be "accented on the first syllable" (see note to rule 8) It would appear to admit of question, in-

10 *antar ity 'asmin padē' 'nādyudātte visarjanīyāh svaragho-
shavatparo repham āpadyate' yathā' antar---- agnīm----
antar---- anādyudātta iti kim esho---- evampara iti kim
antas---- 'antodātta iti vaktavye' bahusvaratvam bahūpādā-
nārthanī' anyathā tv' antodāttasyāi 'va syāt ' antarv---- an-
tary---- ādāv udātto yasya tad ādyudāttam nā 'dyudāttam
anādyudāttam tasmin*

(¹) G M *etasmīn* (²) G M *āpnoti* (³) G M om (⁴) G M om (⁵) W O *īhah*
(⁶) B om (⁷) G M *hy*

deed, whether *ānantah* was not fairly included in the present rule, since the *antah* part of it, at any rate, is not "accented on the first," but the treatise chooses to avoid so nice a question of interpretation, and to take the safe side

आवृत्परः ॥ ११ ॥

11 Also a *visarjanīya* followed by *āvrt*

The quoted examples are *jinvar āvrt svāhā* and *ugnar āvrt svāhā* (both ॥ 4 7¹ B has *bhīnar* for *ugnar*, O reads in each case *āvrt*h, according to the requirements of rule xiv 12) Other instances in the same and following divisions of the same section are *bhīnar āvrt*, *tveshar āvrt*, *grutah āvrt*, and *bhūtar āvrt* The anomalous combination does not occur elsewhere

इतिपरो अपि ॥ १२ ॥

12 And likewise when *iti* follows

The word *api* in this rule, we are told, brings forward the implication of "a *visarjanīya* followed by *āvrt*" According to the commentator's exposition, further, the rule is intended to apply to the *jatā* repetition of *grutah* with its predecessor *iti* as, *iti grutah grutah iti* ^{ti} *grutah* (॥ 4 7²) Nor do I see of what other interpretation it is capable, although it seems strange that the irregular conversion of *h* into *r* should be retained in the *jatā*-reading of this word only, and not of the others, where repeated with their respective predecessors It is clearly implied that we are to read, for example, in the first case falling under the preceding rule, *varshan jinvo jinvo varshan varshan jinva*

As counter-example, showing the necessity of the implication signified by *api*, we receive *rtubhir havanagrutah* (॥ 4 14⁵ G M O omit the first word, G M add *havam*, but no such word follows in the Sanhitā, and the addition is doubtless a copyist's error—possibly growing out of the attempt to repeat the compound, in its *pada* or *jatā* form) Here both the *pada*-text (as the word is a compound) and the *jatā* (as it stands before a pause) would read *havanagruta iti havana-grutah*, the ordinary *sandhi* being made of *grutah* and *iti*

अह्वारहःसुवरनिग्यान्तः ॥ १३ ॥

11 *āvrt ity evamparo visarjanīyo repham āpnoti jin v----*
ugn-----

12 *apīcābda āvrtparam¹ visarjanīyam anvādeṣati asāu vi-*
sarjanīya itiparo repham āpnoti iti gr----- anvādeṣaḥ kim-
arthah rtu----- itih² paro yasmād asāv itiparah

¹ W O *-paro*, G M *-para* ² W B *iti*, O *itīcābda*

13 Also in *ahāh*, *ahah*, and *suvaḥ*, except at the end of a separable word

There is a well-established difference of reading in the text itself of this rule. T and W read the last word *anīṅgyāntāh*, as plural, to agree with the three words mentioned, or else with the three cases of *visarjanīya* which they present, and at the beginning of the comment, both in W and in O, is seen an attempt to explain the word as a plural—not, however, consistently carried out in either. As both readings are equally acceptable, I have adopted the one which is best supported.

The examples given in illustration of the rule are *ahār jātavēdā vicarshanīh* (iii 2 5⁴ O omits the last word), *ahar māñsena* (v 7 20 but G M substitute *aharbhāḥyo vā*, vii 4 5¹), and *suvar devāñ aganma* (i 7 9² O omits the last word) and, as counter examples, first, to show that the *h* in the words specified, when they stand as final members of compounds, is treated in the usual manner, *abhipūrvam tryahā bhavanti* (vii 3 9² et al., p. *tri-ahāh* O omits the first word), *pratyah tryaho bhavati* (vii 3 5² et al., p. *tri-ahah* but B has dropped out the whole example, and G M O substitute, O with omission of the first word, *pratyah shad-aho bhavati*, vii 4 2⁵), and *devasuva stha te* (i 8 10² but W B O give simply the *pada*-reading of *devasuvaḥ*, namely *devasuva iti deva-suvaḥ*, since thus alone is the word put into circumstances which show its *h* not to be convertible into *r*), and second, to show that the conversion takes place only before sonant letters, *prāyañyam ahas tismāt* (vii 2 8¹ O omits the first word), and *suvaḥ ca mārādhā ca* (i 7 9¹ and iv 7 11²).

The commentator then proceeds to give an explanation, so far as *ahāh* is concerned, respecting the virtual intent of the rule, which, he says, is meant to establish an exception for that word when the final member of a compound, since the inclusion of *hāh* among the words cited in rule 8 would, under the operation of the often-quoted rule 152, be authority sufficient for turning *ahāh* into *ahā* before a sonant letter. Upon this he next imagines the objection to be raised, that the reading in this rule also, as well as the other, should have been *hāh*, *ahah* being then included along with it according to the principle referred to, and thus the liability to reproach for overdoing the explicitness of the rule would be avoided.

13. *ahāh ahah suvaḥ eteshi¹ visarjanīyo² 'anīṅgyāntāh' svaraghoṣhavatparo repham āpnoti⁴ yathā⁵ ahār... ahār... suvar... anīṅgyānta iti kim abhip... praty... dev... evampara iti kim prāy... suvaḥ... hvārābhāḥ* (viii 8) ° *ādīsūtre hār ity anena grahanenā 'hāḥcabdasyā' 'py akārādā* (152) *iti vacanād rephasiddhāu satyām atra punarvacanam anīṅgyāntasyā 'hāḥcabdasya pratishedhārthum nanv atrāḥ 'vā' hār iti vaktavyam apy akārādā* (152) *iti vacanena kāryasiddheḥ na tu tadgūravāpattel³ iti cet mār 'vam anīṅg*

ed But he replies, reasonably enough, that, as the rule says "when not the final member of a separable word," it is to be inferred that the words specified do occur as such members and with *hāh* that is not the case, wherefore the distinction would be meaningless with reference to *hāh*. And it would be a poor enough side to take, and altogether unworthy of approval, to give a direction which did not apply to a word itself, but only to that word with *a* prefixed. Hence the quotation is made in proper form.

Just as long a discussion might have been raised with equal reason over *ahah* and *suvaḥ*, both of which are also included in the former rule. So far as *ahah* is concerned, indeed, it is easy to see that this is the general rule, applying to the cases of occurrence of that word in the main, with a specific restriction, and that *ahah-ahah* in rule 8 is a sort of exception in advance, made for a single case which would otherwise fall under this restriction (since, in *ahah-ahah*, the second *ahah* is in fact the final member of a compound). But I am unable to discover any justification of the way in which *suvaḥ* is treated: it is made the subject of two general rules, to the one of which a needed restriction is attached, to the other, not. For *ahāh* and *suvaḥ*, the present rule should, it seems, have taken distinctly the form of an exception merely *nā 'hāh-suvar vīgyāntāu*, 'not, however, *ahāh* and *suvaḥ*, when final members of compounds,' and *ahah* should have been separately treated, or else included with them and a further counter-exception added.

न भिर्भापरः ॥ १४ ॥

14 Not, however, when followed by *bhīh* or *bhyām*

There is violation of the ordinary usage of the Pratiśākhya in this rule also. The only one of the words mentioned in the preceding rule which is found with the case-endings *bhīh* and *bhyām* following it is *ahah*, and hence, to it alone the present precept applies. We should expect it, therefore, in accordance with the principle of which 158 is an expression, to have been placed last in the trio of which it forms a member. The commentator does not remark upon the irregularity, but simply points out that the

yānta ity ukte⁹ vīgyāntatvam¹⁰ it¹¹ sambhāvanīyam tac ca hāh ity evamrūpe¹² grahane nā 'stī 'ty¹³ atre 'dam viśeṣhanam anarthakam syāt tathā 'py¹⁴ evamrūpe nā bhūd iti¹⁵ 'kim tv¹⁶ akā-rādīve bhavati 'tr jaghanyah pakṣah na tu saralāh iti sūtre¹⁷ 'hār¹⁸ ity grahanam upayogyate

¹ O *eshu padeshu* ² W *-yā* ³ W *anvīgyāntah*, O *-ta* ⁴ O *apnūvanti* ⁵ G M O om ⁶ G M ins *ity* ⁷ G M *'vā* ⁸ O *tatra gauravadoshāp*, G M *tatra gāugavadeshop* ⁹ W *ukten*, G M O *ukte* ¹⁰ G M *āntam* ¹¹ G M O *api* ¹² G M O *-pa* ¹³ W om *iti* ¹⁴ G M O *sah* a better reading ¹⁵ O om ¹⁶ G M om, O *kim tv apy* ¹⁷ G M O *sutaram* ¹⁸ MSS *ahar*

circumstances of the case restrict the application of the rule to *ahah*, and gives as examples *uttarāṇi ahobhīḥ caranti* (vii 5 1⁴ G M O omit the last word), and *śam ahobhīḥ ite ni nayati* (vi 3 9¹)

अश्नुश्च सर्वेषाम् ॥ १५ ॥

15 Also not in *añḥah*, as all agree

Some authorities, namely, the commentator informs us, accept this word as containing an *anusvāra*, others not, but all alike regard it as an exception under rule 13 (and therefore not liable to have its final *visarjanīya* converted into *ṛ* under any circumstances) Those who accept the *anusvāra* still regard the word as falling under the action of rule 13, in virtue of the principle "a nose-sound occurring in the interior of a word is no bar to the application of a rule, hence it performs the offices of letters while itself only a quality" (if this be, in fact, the meaning of the second line of the verse, of which I am by no means confident, the readings of the manuscripts are here somewhat discordant, without being mutually explanatory) The first words of this verse were quoted in the comment on rule 11, in connection with the discussion as to whether *anusvāra* was a concrete thing or a quality (see p 8), and were credited to the Çikshā—which, however, in the form in which we now possess it, neither contains such a passage, nor seems to furnish a connection in which it should naturally be introduced I should question the sober verity of the considerations whereby the commentator tries to justify the rule It is hardly credible that *añḥah* and *ahah* should be fairly identified by any authorities And *anusvāra* is not a *nāsika*, but an *anu-nāsika*, in the view of this treatise everywhere It might be bet-

14 *sāmnidhyena*¹ *labdhah*² *pārasūtrokto visarjanīyo*³ *bhū-*
*bhīḥ*⁴ *evam*⁵ *na repham āpnoti arthād aha ity atra vi-*
*sarjanīyah pañgrhyate ita atasthitasya*⁶ *vampātvābhāvāt*
yathā utt---- śam----

¹ G M O *dhyā* ² W *labhyah* ³ W *ins na* ⁴ O *ins ity* ⁵ G M *parā*

15 *cahā*¹ *nishedham ākāśhat*² *añḥa ity asmin*³ *grāhane vi-*
sarjanīyo na repham āpnoti ahārahā (viii 13) *ite prāptih*
*atra*⁴ *grāhane kecid anusvāram icchanti* *'kecin ne 'chanti sarve-*
*śām*⁵ *teshām esha*⁶ *nishedho bhavati anusvāram icchadbhir api*
*prāptiṇ evam pratipādyate*⁷

*vidher madhyasthanāsikyo na virodho*⁸ *'bhavet smṛtaḥ*⁹

*tasmāt karoti*¹⁰ *kāryāni vānānām* ¹⁰ *dharma eva*¹⁰ *tv*
*ite yathā*¹¹ *añḥa----* *añḥo----*

(¹) G M O *-dhākarśhakah* (²) G M *etasmān* (³) O *asmin* (⁴) G M *om* (⁵) G M *eva* (⁶) G M *paḍy-* (⁷) B *dhi* (⁸) B *bhavet satah*, G M *bhavet yatah*
(⁹) B G M *kurvanti* (¹⁰) W *dharmanas* (¹¹) G M *om*

ter to regard the specific exception of *añḥaḥ* as simply a sort of supererogatory effort at extreme explicitness, intended to guard against the confusion with *ahah*, even by a blunderer, of another word which was, indeed, definitely different from it, but different by only so inconspicuous an element as the nasalization of a vowel.

The illustrative examples are *añḥa indram evā 'ñhomucam* (ii 2 7⁴ but O writes ---- *era añhomucam*, as if the latter word were a separate citation it is found in other passages), and *añhomuce pra bharema* (i 6 12³ but O substitutes *añhomuce jnu odā-gam*, ii 2 7⁴)

अनवर्णपूर्वस्तु रेफपरो लुप्यते ॥ १६ ॥

16 But, when not preceded by an *a* vowel, *visarjanīya* followed by *ṛ* is omitted

The commentator's example in illustration of the action of this rule is *revatī amadhīam* (i 3 7¹ et al., *p revatīh*), and he adds as counter-examples, first, to show the necessity of the restriction "not preceded by an *a*-vowel," *yo rudhō agnīu* (v 5 9³), and again, to show that the omission takes place only before a *ṛ*, *revatīr nah adhamādah* (ii 2 12³, 4 14⁴). This exhausts the evident intent of the rule the *tu*, 'but,' which the latter contains, merely indicates the transition to a new and diverse subject, it intimates no distinction between the classes of cases in which the *visarjanīya* represents a *s* on the one hand and an original *ṛ* on the other, and all the cases of final *ah* and *āh* are left to be treated alike, as prescribed by the rules given hereafter (iv 7-10)—*ah* being changed to *o*, and *āh* to *ā*. This truly represents the usage of the *Sanhitā* the latter does not contain (if the special case which forms the subject of rules 18-22, below, be excepted) a single instance of *ah* converted into *ā* before *ṛ* the occurrence before *ṛ* of *ah* standing for original *ar* is very rare, and the product is always *o* besides the cases of *ahorātre* (*padu*-text, *ahāhātre*), I have

16 *avanāḍ anyasvapūvo rephapaṇo visarjanīyo lupyate yathā¹ ev----- evampūva itī kim yo----- evampara itī kim ev----- tuṣabddāmbhād avanapūvo² pr hvārābhāḍī* (viii 8) *ādīnām visargo lupyate pūvasvaraṣ ca dīgham āpadyate yathā² rukmo----- tanh suvo----- ity atīa lopadīrghāu kim na syātām dviruktatīd itī brāmah tat katham hvārābhāḍī* (viii 8) *ādīsutīe³ ahārāhahsuvarī* (viii 13) *ity atra ca nanv ahorātre ity atīa katham otram anyārthēna grahanasāmāthyene⁴ itī brāmah tat⁴ katham ahorātre dhr-tavīate⁵* (iv 11) *ity evamrūpasāmyād⁶ ahorātrī abhīyām ahorātrīayor⁷ ity ādā vyñeyam⁸ ⁹evam ced adhīshavane* (iv 11) *itī grahanasāmāthyendī⁹ va⁹ ¹⁰shatve siddhe¹¹ ¹²na dhi-pūrve* (vi 11) *itī ¹³nishedhanishedhena virodhah¹³ satyam sa-*

only found four instances of *suvaḥ* before forms of *ruḥ*, namely *suvo ruhāndh* (iv 1 2⁴, 7 13¹), *suvo rohāva* (i 7 9¹), and *suvo ro-kshyāmi* (i 7 9¹). The other Prāticakhyas (Rik Pr iv 9, r 28, 29, Vāj Pr iv 34, Ath Pr ii 19, iii 20) convert *ah* to *ā* in like circumstances, and at least the Rik and Atharvan afford several instances of the *sandhi*.

So much for the rule and its meaning. The commentator, unfortunately, has found occasion to give it a forced and false interpretation, it leads him into a nest of difficulties, through which he flounders as best he can, coming out at the end with much discredit. There happens to be a single passage (or, if there be another, I have not noticed it) where a word with original final *r* follows in the Sanhitā a word beginning with *r*—namely *rukmo antah* (iv 1 10⁴ 5, 6 5², 7 12³)—and, of course, in the inversions of the *jatā*-text, comes to stand before its predecessor. The accepted *jatā*-reading, it appears (as given in full by the commentator), is *rukmo antar antā rukmo rukmo antah*, the analogy of the Rik and Atharvan usage being followed in the treatment of *antah*. In order, now, to find authority for this reading, the commentator declares that *tu*, 'but,' in the rule signifies that, even when preceded by an *a*-vowel, the words specified in rule 8 and its successors lose their *nasajaniya* and lengthen the preceding vowel. This is an attribution of portentous pregnancy of meaning to the particle such as is not very infrequently made, rarely with more evident falsity than here. The objection is immediately suggested—why, in that case, does not *suvaḥ* in *suvo rohāva* (i 7 9¹) lose its *h* and lengthen its *a*? Because, is the acute reply, it has been mentioned twice, once in rule 8, and once in rule 13. What possible connection is to be discovered between this repetition and the use to which he would fain put it, he does not give himself the trouble to inform us. He takes care to raise only such difficulties as he conceives himself able to remove. The next which it pleases him to evoke is—how is the *o* of *ahorātre* to be explained? We rather

vaçabdasya 'dhiśhavane ite grahanasāmanthyena'¹⁰ śharvān siddhyatu sthānaçabdasya katham siddhyet grahanādisāmanthyā-bhāvāt¹⁴ tasmāt tadartham¹⁵ tāvat¹⁶ sātram sārthakam ite¹⁷ tadartham ca drashtavyam¹⁷ tadartham ce¹⁸ 'ti gudahrvikānyāyah¹⁹ tathā hi grahanasāmanthyād²⁰ ite²¹ gamanikānātram²² kunthoktis tu vçeshah tathā savagubdātham²³ sātram ite bhāvah²⁴

avarnād anyo 'navarnah asū pūrvo yasmāt sa tathoktah repah paro yasmād asū repahparah

¹ B G M O om ² W B G M om ³ W B ins *ah mahar ite* ⁴ W B O om
⁵ O *adhishavane* ⁶ G M *pragrahe evam upasamanthyad* ⁷ G M *tre* ⁸ B
jñeyam ⁽⁹⁾ O *namu anyarthena grahanena* ¹⁰ *va* ⁽¹¹⁾ G M om ¹² O *siddhih*
¹³ B ins *nishādhe* ⁽¹⁴⁾ O *śatvanishedhanishādho na vidheyah*, B *nishedho na*
iti virodhah ¹⁵ B *nasam-* ¹⁶ B *artham*, G M *tadav istham* ¹⁷ G M *vā tat*
⁽¹⁸⁾ G M O *samtoshtavyam* ¹⁹ G M *ve* ²⁰ G M *gulu* ²¹ O *thyam* ²² O
om, G M *2* ²³ G M *kam* ²⁴ G M *savasthanaçab*, O adds *api* ²⁵ G M
gāvah

expect to hear him reply—because *ahah* also is twice mentioned, in the same two rules with *suvaḥ*. But no, we do injustice to the tenderness of his exegetical conscience, in supposing him capable of such gross arbitrariness of interpretation, when in rule 8, instead of *ahah*, *aharahah* is read. He alleges instead the competency of a form cited for another purpose (compare Rik Pr 1.13, r liv, 55) we have read in rule iv 11 *ahorātre*, where the *pragrahas* are under treatment, and this suffices, by analogy of form, to determine the reading also of *ahorātrābhyām* and *ahorātrayoh*. If this be so, it is next retorted, then, as the *śh* of *adhishavane*, which is cited in the same rule, is assured by the citation itself, rule vi 11, prescribing the *śh*, in the way of an exception to an exception, is out of order. That is true, the commentator confesses—but, granting that the *śh* of *sava* is established by the previous mention of *adhishavane*, how is that of *sthāna*, the other word specified in the same rule, established? the rule is therefore to be deemed of force so far as relates to that word, and to be regarded as intended for it. Of what follows, not all is clear to me—it appears that the rule is, after all, defended as it stands, on “the principle of sugar-candy and little tongue” (i.e. as merely giving more than is absolutely required of what one cannot receive too much of, as the palate of candy—?) for to establish the reading on the authority of a previous citation is only doing just what will answer (? *gamanihā* occurs in only one other passage, the comment on 1.18, and I find nowhere anything that explains its use), while specific mention is a distinction, hence the rule has a meaning as applied to *sava* also—such is the understanding.

The commentator might much better, surely, have acknowledged that his text-book had omitted to provide for the special case of *yatā*-reading which has caused all this trouble, than have forced it within the contemplation of the rules at such cost.

दीर्घ च पूर्वः ॥ १७ ॥

17 And the preceding vowel is made long

The “and” (*ca*) in the rule is declared to signify that the lengthening of the vowel takes place only when *visarjanīya* has been omitted. The cited examples are *rurā rūdraḥ* (v 5 19), *tittiri rohit* (v 5 16), and *viśhnū rūpam krtvā* (vi 2 4² only G M have the last word). As was noticed in the comment upon the preceding rule, there is no such case of *ah* changed to *ā* before *r*, except the one forming the special subject of the following rules

* 17 *tasmād repahaparavisarjanīyāl hṛtāt pūrvo 'pa' yah svarō hrasvaḥ sa ca dīrgham āpadyate yathā¹ rurā---- tittiri---- viśhnū---- yathā² visarjanīyasya lopas tadā³ 'va dīrghatvam yathā syād ity evamarthaḥ caṣabdah*

¹ O om ² G M om ³ G M O ms *tasya*

एष्टश्च ॥ १८ ॥

18 As also, in *eshtah*

This word has been already mentioned, in rule 8, as one of those whose final *h* is liable to become *r*. It is here made the further subject of a special rule, because it is the only case in the *Sanhitā* of *ah* changed to *ā* before *r* (see the note to rule 16). The passage in which it occurs is *eshtā rāyah* (i 2 11¹ and vi 2 26).

We have seen, however, that the commentator has felt obliged to give a false interpretation to rule 16, and one which renders superfluous the present rule, as applying to a case already included under that one. He is well aware of the objection to his interpretation thence arising, and himself points out that *eshtā rāyo rāya eshtar eshtā rāyah* (only W gives this) is a case analogous with *rukmo antar antā rukmo rukmo antah* (W B omits the last two words), and that the loss of *h* and lengthening of *a* in *eshtah* is an effect of the *tu* in rule 16, but he does what he can toward removing the objection by alleging that the detail of discordant opinions which is to follow (in the next four rules) renders it more desirable to cite the case specially, in order that it may be understood to what those opinions apply. This is a tolerably ingenious subterfuge—but, after all, only a subterfuge.

नैकेषाम् ॥ १९ ॥

19 Not so, according to some authorities

The commentator gives two alternative explanations of this rule—both, however, as he notices, leading to the same reading of the phrase under question. Vararuci, namely, holds that, in the view of some, the rule denies the conversion of *h* to *r* in *eshtah*, and therefore also the prolongation of the *a*, whence, by the general rule ix 8, the word would become *eshṭo* (in analogy with all the other cases in the text of *ah* before *r*). Māṇisheya, however, understands that some are said to deny that the *h* of *eshtah* is liable to conversion into *r* before another *r*—that is to say, he makes the rule establish so far an exception under rule 8 rather than rule

18 *eshtar ity asmin grahane visarjanīyo repḥaparo*¹ 'varna-pūrvo' *pa*² *kupyate*³ *yathā*⁴ *eshtā*---- *caḥabdo lopadīrghayor ākarṣhakāḥ*⁵ *nam etad anupapannam* *hṛdā abhār* (VIII 8) *ādyaṇṭahpātītṛvād eshtar ity asya*⁶ *eshtā*---- *rukmo* ---- *itvat*⁷ *anavarnapūrvvas tu* (VIII 16) *ity atra tuḥabdena*⁸ *lopadīrghasiddhāḥ*⁹. ¹⁰*mā* ¹¹*vam*¹² *vakshyamānamatabhedācra-yatvajñāpandya grhītam etad upapannataram* *iti parāhārāḥ*

¹ W B *repḥah* ² O om ³ G. M ins *pūrvva* ca *dirghah* ⁴ G. M om, ⁵ G. M *ghāv akarṣhata*, and put at the beginning ⁶ B G M O om ⁷ W *iti*, G. M *iti padam* ⁸ G. M *caḥabde* ⁹ B *-chāgruteh*, G. M O *dāhe* ¹⁰ W B O om

18 There can be little question that Vararuci's explanation is the true one

In rule 21, below, we have yet another mode taught of arriving at the same result as regards the reading

द्वावुत्तमोत्तरीयस्य रेफम् ॥ २० ॥

20 According to Uttamottariya, two become *r*

Here, again, there are two interpretations, Vararuci giving one, Māhīsheya the other. The former says that, in the opinion of the specified authority (*śākhin*, 'holder of a *śākhā* or recension of the sacred text'), the *visarjanīya* of *eshtaḥ* and the following *r* both become *r*—that is, as I should think it ought to mean, both fuse together into a single *r*—thus, *eshtarāyah*—but none of the manuscripts give this reading in illustrating the case—see the various readings below. Māhīsheya, on the other hand, regards the individual referred to as owning the portentous name Dvāvut-tamottariya, and as holding that the *h* of *eshtaḥ* becomes *r* before *r*, making *eshtar rāyah*.

Vararuci here maintains, in my opinion, his usual superiority over Māhīsheya, as regards both the plausibility of the name assumed and the admissibility of the reading taught, and I have accordingly made my translation conform with his interpretation.

It is interesting to note the uncertainty of the tradition within reach of the commentators as to the personality of the authorities quoted by the Pratiśākhya.

सांकृत्यस्योकारम् ॥ २१ ॥

21 According to Sāmkrtya, the *visarjanīya* becomes *u*

And this *u*, by x 5, unites with the preceding *a* to form *o*, so that the reading of the passage is *eshto rāyah*, as it is according

19 *ekeshām mata eshtar iti visarjanīyo rephaparo na lupyate ata eva pūrvavaradīrghābhāvaḥ ca kim tu ghoshavatparaḥ ca* (1x 8) 'ity oṣvam' yathā *eshto rāyah vararucivracitam etat¹ māhīsheyabhāṣitam tv² evam eshtar iti visarjanīyo rephaparo* 'repham nā³ 'padyata iti⁴ *siddharāpam ubhayoh samānam*

(¹) W om (²) G M om (³) G M ca (⁴) G M na *repham āpnoti* (⁵) O om na

20 *uttamottariyasya śākhino¹ mata eshtar iti visarjanīyas² tūtparo rephaḥ ca dvāv etāu repham āpadyete yathā eshtar³ rāyah ayam artho vārarucoktaḥ⁴ māhīsheyoktas tu dvāvut-tamottariya iti kasya cin nāma tanmata eshtar⁵ iti visarjanīyo rephaparo repham āpadyate* ⁶ *eshtar⁷ rāya iti⁸*

(¹) O nor (²) G M -yaḥ ca (³) B G M -tā, O -tār (⁴) W B O var- (⁵) W B *eshtā rāya*. (⁶) O ms yathā (⁷) B G M -tā (⁸) G M O om

to the "some authorities" quoted in rule 19, above. This is pointed out by the commentator, who, however, declares that the reference to Śāmkṛtya in a separate place shows that he is not one of the people there spoken of. B specifies (probably by a copyist's blunder) that the exposition given of the meaning of the rule is to be credited to Māhisheya.

उख्यस्य सपूर्वः ॥ २२ ॥

22 And, according to Ukhyā, along with the preceding letter

That is, *eshtar* becomes *eshtu*, the *h* and its predecessor *a* coalescing into *u*. This is the only exposition given by W and O. But G, M and B, strangely agreeing for once to differ from the rest, ascribe this understanding of the meaning of the rule to Māhisheya, and report Vararuci as holding it to signify that the *h* of *eshtaḥ*, with its predecessor, becomes *r*. This last version of the *sandhi* seems little better than nonsense, and neither of the MSS gives a reading to correspond.

The commentator declares, finally, that, in this net-work of alternative views, the first rule only (viii 18) is approved. In accordance herewith is the reading of the edited text and of my manuscript, *eshtā rāyah*.

The most interesting circumstance connected with this waste of half a dozen rules over the reading of a single word, is the indication afforded of the anomalousness of the combination as a phenomenon belonging to the Tāttirīya-Saṁhitā, while it is in other Vedic texts a natural and usual thing.

काखपकारपरः षमकारपूर्वः समवग्रहः ॥ २३ ॥

21 *sāmkṛtyasya mata eshtar iti visarjanīyo rephapara ukāram āpadyate¹ tata² uvarnapara okāram (x 5) ity otvam yathā³ eshto rāyah asya ca nāi 'keshām (viii.18) ity asya⁴ deṣabhedād bheduḥ siddhodāharanam⁵ samānam*

¹ B adds *iti māhisheyoktam* ² G M om ³ W B G M om ⁴ G M O ins *ca* ⁵ G M O ins *tu*

22 *ukhyasya mate rephapara¹ eshtar iti visarjanīyah pūrva-varnena saho 'kāram āpadyate 'iti māhisheyoktam² yathā³ eshtu⁴ rāyah 'vārarucoktam⁵ tv eshtar iti visarjanīyo rephaparak pūrvēna saha repham āpadyata iti⁶ yathā⁷ 'eshtā¹⁰ rāyah^{8,9} pūrvēna saha vartata iti sapūrvah*

asmīn vikalpagāle¹¹ prathamam eshtaḥ ca (viii 18) iti sūtram eve 'shtam

¹ G M om, O puts after *iti* ⁽²⁾ W om, O *iti* ³ G M om ⁴ B -to, G M *ta* ⁽⁵⁾ W O om ⁶ B var- ⁷ G M om ⁸ G M om ⁽⁹⁾ M om ¹⁰ B -trā ¹¹ W -gāle

23 At the end of the former member of a compound, before *k*, *kh*, or *p*, *visarjanīya* becomes *sh*—or *s*, if preceded by *a*

The commentator notes the fact that, as a different following occasion is here introduced, the implication “followed by a vowel or a sonant consonant,” which has so long been in force (namely, since rule 3 of this chapter), comes to an end. His illustrative examples are *atho havishkrtānām eva* (vi 4 3³ O omits *eva*), *grasitām nishkṛdāt* (vi 1 9¹ O omits the first word), *bahishpavamāna upasadyah* (vi 4 9² O omits the last word), *namaskārār evār nam* (v 5 7⁴ O omits *enam*), and *pathaspathah paripatim* (i 1 14² O omits the last word). As counter-example, to show that the *h* must end the first member of a compound, not an independent word, we have *pushpāvatiḥ prasāvatiḥ* (iv 2 6¹), and *namah pitrbhyo abhi* (ii 2 8³ only G M have *abhi*).

This is a general rule, applying to almost all the compounds in the Sanhitā which show a final *h* before an initial *k*, *kh*, or *p* of the second member. A few exceptions are mentioned farther on (rules 32, 33)

आविर्निरिःशश्वताऽपसोदिवरिषोऽहसोऽतिदिवोवि-
श्वतोऽश्मनस्तमसः ॥ २४ ॥

24 Also in *āvih*, *nih*, *idah*, *ṣacvatah*, *apasah*, *deva rishah*, *añhasah*, *atr divah*, *viṣvatah*, *açmanah*, and *tamasah*

This rule, the commentator remarks, relates to words which are not first members of compounds. His examples are for *āvih*, *āvish krnushva* (i 2 14²). For *nih*, *ghrtam nish pibati* (ii 3 11⁵).

23 *atra paramittaviṣeshanād¹ etatparyantā² svaraghoshavat-
parānuvrttī³ mantavyā avagrahāntavartī⁴ visarjanīyah kakāra-
khakārapakāraparah shakāram āpadyate akārapūrvāḥ cet sakā-
ram yathā⁵ atho---- gras---- bahish---- namas----
pathas---- avagraha itī kim push---- namah---- ka-
kāraḥ ca khakāraḥ ca pakāraḥ ca kakhapakārāḥ te⁶ parē⁷ yas-
mād asū⁸ tathoktah akārah pūrvo yasmād asū akārapūrvāḥ*

¹ G M -shād ² W etavatp- ³ G M -paratvān- ⁴ W -havatara, B -ha, G M -havarti ⁵ G M om ⁶ O ete ⁷ G M parā ⁸ G M O sa

24 ¹----- eshu¹ visarjanīyah kakhapakāraparo ² yathāvhi-
tam³ bhagate yathā⁴ āvish---- ghrtam---- idas----
ṣaṣv---- apasas---- uror----: deve 'ti kim sa---- añ-
hasas---- atri---- atī 'ti kim divah---- viṣv---- tvam
---- ud----

anavagrahārtho 'yam ārambhah.

(¹) G M āvīrādāshu vādyamāno ² G M ms. hi shakaram akārapūrvāḥ cet sa-
kāram itī ³ G -itāsamh- ⁴ G M O om

of *nish* before *p*, I find besides only *nish padhyeran* (vii 3 10²), before *kh*, *nish khidatī* (ii 2 10⁵), before *k*, the cases are more numerous, with forms of *krī* (e g v 5 7²), and *kram* (vi 4 10^{2 3} doubtless, the separation of the divisions prevents the exhibition of the *sandhi*), cases of *nih* with accented forms of verbs in *k* are yet more frequent, but come under the preceding rule, not this one. For *idah, idas pade sam idhyase* (ii 6 11⁴ and iv 4 4⁴ O omits the last two words) on the other hand, we have *idāyāh pade* at vi 1 8² For *ṣaṣvatah, ṣaṣvatas kar haste* (ii 2 12¹) For *apasah, apasas pāre asya* (iii 2 11² O omits *asya*) For *deva rishah, uror ā no deva rishas pāhi* (i 4 45² O omits to *deva*), with *sa rishah pātu naktam* (i 2 14⁷, 5 11^{1 2}) as counter-example, to show that the prescribed effect takes place only after *deva*. For *añhasah, añhasas pātu vāyuh* (iii 2 4³ only O has *vāyuh*) another case is found in the same division, *añhasas pātam*. For *atī divah, atī divas pāhi samdvavrtan* (i 8 14² G M O omit after *pāhi*), with *divah prsthithāṣṣuvar gatvā mīrāh* (iv 6 5¹ only B has the last word, O omits the last three) as counter-example, to show that the prescribed effect takes place only after *atī*. For *viṣvatah, viṣvatas pari havāmahe* (i 6 12¹ G M omit the last word) other cases occur at i 5 3³ ii 1 11¹, 3 14¹ iii 1 11⁴ iv 2 1³, 3⁴, 3 13⁸ (in the various repetitions of only two phrases, always before *pari*), and, as first member of a compound, hence falling under the preceding rule, at iv 6 2⁴ an exception is noted in a later rule (viii 32) For *aṣmanah, tvam aṣmanas pari* (iv 1 2⁵) For *tamasah, ud vayam tamasas pari paśyantah* (iv 1 7⁴ and v 1 8⁶ only O has the last word, and it omits the first two)

कृधिपिन्वपथपरः ॥ २५ ॥

25 Also before *krdhi*, *pinva*, and *pathe*

The examples are *uru nas krdhi* (ii 6 11³), *apas pinva* (iv 3 4³), and *saprathā namas pathe* (iv 7 13² G M omit the first word) For *pinva* and *pathe* I find no further examples, but *s* before *krdhi* occurs also at i 4 2 (where the edition has the false reading *h*), 3 iv 2 9⁴, 5 10² v 7 6^{3,4} vi 3 2², 4 5⁴.

न सक्रघकारपरे ॥ २६ ॥

26 But not when *s*, *kr*, or *gh* follows

25 ----- *evamparo visarjanīyo yathāvidhīm¹ bhayate ya-*
thā². uru----- apas----- sapr-----

¹ O *vihitam* ² G M O om

26 *sakraghe¹ 'ty evampare satī krdhyādān² visarjanīyo yathā-*
vhitam³ nā⁴ padhyate yathā⁴ tān----- ṣam----- repheṇa kim-
uta----- uru-----

¹ W adds *kāre satī* ² O *-ādā* ³ G M *-vidhīm* ⁴ W B G M om

By its terms, the rule means that the prescription of the preceding rule becomes void when either of the words there mentioned is followed as here specified, but the cases of its application, so far as I am aware, all concern *krđhi*. The commentator's illustrations are *tān ma āmanasah krđhi svāhā* (ii 3 9¹ only W has the first two words, and it omits the last one), *gam ca nah krđhi kratve dakshāya* (iii 3 11⁴ O omits the last word), and *uru kshayāya nah krđhi ghr̥tam ghr̥tayone* (i 3 4¹ G M O omit the last word), and to the second of these there is a counter-example, *uta no mayas krđhi kshayadvīrāya* (iv 5 10²), to show that only *kr̥*, not *k* alone, gives occasion for retention of the *h*. The words *āmanasah krđhi svāhā* occur again at ii 3 9². I find no other cases to be specified in addition to those quoted by the commentator

पत्नीविपतीपतेपतयेपतिष्यतिपरः ॥ २७ ॥

27 Also before *patnī ve*, *patī*, *pate*, *pataye*, *patih*, and *patm*

The examples are first, *brahmanas patnī vedim* (iii 5 6¹), with a counter-example, to show that the word *patnī* must be followed by *ve*, *retodhāh patnī va ity āha* (vi 5 8⁴ but O reads *indrīyā-vutah patnīvantam*, i 4 27), further, *gubhas patī idam aham* (iii 2 10² only O has *aham*), *vāstosh pate prati* (iii 4 10¹), *pracyavasva bhuvas pate* (i 2 9 and vi 1 11⁴), *vācas pataye pavasva* (i 4 2), *vācas patir vācam* (i 7 7¹), and *vācas patim vīśvācarmānam ūtaye* (iv 6 2⁵ G M O omit the last word). The inquiry is now raised, why it was necessary to give all these words in detail, instead of comprehending them all in *pat*, and in reply is quoted the passage *divam gacha suvah pata* (iv 1 10⁵ and v 1 10⁶).

The cases of retention of *s* before the cases of *pat* are so numerous, that it would be highly convenient to be able to dispose of them at once by quoting in the rule the theme *pat*, but such a proceeding is permitted (by i 22) only with themes ending in *a*. I add the other combinations of this class which I have noted from the Sanhitā: *manasas pati* (i 1 13³, 4 44³), *pathas pati* (i 1 14²), *brahmanas pati* (i 5 6⁴ ii 1 5⁷), *jyotishas pati* (i 5 11¹ iv 4 4⁶), *çavasas pati* (ii 2 12⁷), *jagatas pati* (ii 4 5¹), *sadasas pati* (ii 6 8² iii 2 4⁴), *patinas pati* (ii 6 11¹ iv 4 4¹), *nabhasas pati* (iii 3 8^{3,6}), and *yas patih* (iv 7 14³). We have the genitive *pateh* in *brhas-pateh* (i 7 8⁴), but, as the *pada*-text reads *brhah-pateh*, the word does not fall under this rule: *tapaspati* (i 2 10², p *tapah-patih*).

27 ----- *evamparo visarjanīyo yathāvr̥hitam*¹ *bhagate ya-*
*thā*² *brah----- va iti kim reto----- gubh----- vāst-----*
*pra----- vāc----- vāc----- vāc----- pad ity etāvatār*³ *'va*
*siddhe*⁴ *'pratipadapāthēna kim*³ *divam----- ityādīnīśedhār-*
*thāh*⁴

¹ B G M -*vr̥hitm* ² G M O om ³ G M -*thah kimar̥thah*, O -*tho* ⁴ O -*ādāu n*

belongs in the same category. Of the words quoted by the commentator, *bhūvas pari* occurs again at 1 7 10², and *vācas pari* at 11 6 8^{1,2}

दिवःसहसस्परिपुत्परः ॥ २८ ॥

28 Also in *divah* and *sahasah*, before *pari* and *put*

The cited examples are *divas pari prathamam* (13 14⁵ and 14 2 2¹), *divas putrāya sūryāya* (12 9 O omits the last word), and *sahasas putro adbhutah* (14 1 9²). We have *sahasas putram* also at 14 4 4³, and *divas pari* at 11 3 3³ and 14 2 10⁴, one case of *divah pari* is excepted by rule 34, below. As counter-examples, are given *divah prthivyāh pary antarikshāt* (11 1 10² et al. W B O omit *divah*, which is better, as this is used just below to illustrate another point), *parushahparushah pari* (14 2 9²), and *puṇsah putrān uta vīcādyushaṇ rayim* (14 6 9⁴ G M O have only the first two words), to show that only the words specified show *s* before *pari* and *put*, and *divah prthivyāh pari* (11 1 10² et al. G M omit *pari*, which is better this time), to show that those words show it only in the circumstances stated.

Put is declared a part of a word, involving more than one case

रायस्योपरः ॥ २९ ॥

29 Also in *rāyah*, before *po*

The commentator's examples are *paçavo vāi rāyas poshah* (4 4 6²), *saṁ ahañ rāyas poshena* (17 9²), *saṁtanutvāya rāyas poshāya* (11 2 5¹ G M omit the first word and add *brhate*, which makes the reference belong to 14 1 10²), and *rāyas poshasya daditārah syāma* (11 2 3¹ only O has the last word). As counter-examples, he gives *vibhuh posha uta tmanā* (11 1 11²), to show that the rule applies to no other word than *rāyah* before *po*, and *eshtā rāyah pre'she bhagāya* (12 11¹ G M omit the first word),

28 *divah sahasah ity ayo¹ visarjanīyah paṇiputparo² yathāvidhīm³ bhayate divas---- divas pu---- sah---- anayor iti kim divah---- par---- puñ---- evampara iti kim divah---- anekārthatvāt⁴ pud iti padārkadeçah*

¹ B *anayoh*, G M *etayoh* ² G M *pari put* *ity evamparo*, O do except *ity* ³ G M O *-vidhīm* ⁴ B G M O *rthah*

29 *rāya ity atra visarjanīyah po ity evamparo yathāvidhītam¹ bhayate yathā² paçavo---- po iti padārkadeço bahūpādd-nārthah saṁ---- saṁ---- rāyas---- rāya iti kim: vibhuh---- ³po ity okārena kim³ ⁴eshtā----*

¹ G M *-vidhīm* ² G M O om ³ G M *okārah kumarthah* ⁴ B om to *yathā* in comment to next rule

to show that only *po*, not *p* when otherwise followed, calls out the prescribed effect in *rāyaḥ*.

I have not attempted to note the numerous instances of the occurrence of *rāyas* *posha* in the Saṁhitā. In the derivative *āyas-poshavanī* (1 2 12³, 3 1²), where the division is before *vanī*, the *pada*-text, according to its custom, leaves the *s* of *rāyas* unchanged (reading *āyasposha-vanī*).

नमस्क्रोपरः ॥ ३० ॥

30 Also in *namah*, before *karo*

The examples illustrating the action of the rule are *saṁvatsarena namas karomi* (v 5 7³), and *ubhayibhyo namas karoti* (ii 6 9⁸). O reads *karomi*, counter-examples, showing the uselessness of either specification of the rule without the other, are *namah kapardine ca* (iv 5 5¹, 9¹). W omits *ca*, O omits the example), and *ekahāyanād enah karoti* (vi 6 3¹).

Other instances of *namas karoti* are found at v 5 5¹, 7² vi 3 8⁴, and of *vatsarena namas karomi* at v 5 7³ twice, 7⁴ twice.

The printed text has *greyasas karat* and *vasyasas karat* (but, by a strange inconsistency, immediately after, *pacumatah karat*) at i 8 6², but, as these combinations are unauthorized by the Prātiśākhya, and not supported by my manuscript, I do not doubt that the readings are erroneous.

वसुष्कारपरः ॥ ३१ ॥

31 Also in *vasuḥ*, before *k*

The passage is *sa vdhāno vasuḥ kavīḥ* (iv 4 4⁵), and I have found no other. Counter-examples, of obvious application, are given *viprah gūcīḥ kavīḥ* (i 3 14⁸, 5 5³), *mayi vasuḥ puro vasuḥ* (iii 2 10²), and *viṣṭāvasuḥ pary amuṣmāt* (vi 1 6⁵, 11⁵). B, which is quite defective just along here, omits the first word.

नाध्वंविश्वतोऽन्तर्गतोविविश्वः परुः पुनः ॥ ३२ ॥

30 *nama ity atra¹ visarjanīyah karo ity evamparo yathāvihitam² bhayate yathā³ samv----- ubhay-----⁴ karo iti kum namah-----⁵ nama iti kum ekah-----⁶*

¹ G M O om ² G M vdhm ³ G M O om, B omits to here ⁴ O om ⁵ G M put before ubhay-, B puts after ubhay-----, and om karo iti

31 *vasur ity atra visarjanīyah kakāraparo yathāvihitam² āpadyate³ yathā⁴ sa----- vasur iti kum viprah----- evampara iti kum mayi----- viṣṭā-----*

¹ B om. ² G M vdhm ³ G M O bhayate ⁴ G M O om

32 Not in *adhvaram viçvatah, antah, jātah, vviçuḥ paruh,* and *punah*

These words constitute exceptions under the foregoing rules. The commentator specifies in each case under which rule the exception falls. The first example is *yajñam adhvaram viçvatah paribhār asī* (iv 1 11¹ O omits the first word, W B the last) an exception under viii 24, which would require *viçvatas*, W B O remark that the distinctive addition of *adhvaram* effects the exception, and W O add the counter-example *indram vo viçvatas pari* (i 6 12¹). For *antah*, the example is *mahādevam antahpārvena* (i 4 36 O omits the first word) an exception under rule 23, *antah* being first member of a compound. For *jātah*, *bhūtasya jātah patir eka āsit* (iv 2 8² O omits the first word, and alone adds *āsīt*, G M omit *ekah* also) an exception under viii 27. For *vviçuḥ paruh*, *yā dvviçuḥ paruhparuh* (iv 2 6⁴), with the counter-example *parushparur anughushyā viçasta* (iv 6 9³ only G M have the last word). For *punah*, finally, *punahpunar hy asmāt* (vi 5 1^{3 4} only G M have *asmāt*). Both these last are exceptions under viii 23.

The versions of the comment to this rule are more than usually discordant, all being defective except W and O, and even these having suffered considerable disarrangement. For the details, see the various readings below.

धषवति ॥ ३३ ॥

33 Nor before a word containing *dh* or *sh*

"By vicinage," says the commentator, is understood a negative, in this and the next following rule. The meaning of the rule is that, when a word containing either of the letters *dh* or *sh* follows the *visarjanīya*, the latter is not liable to conversion into *s* or *sh*, as required by the foregoing precepts. The examples given are

32 ----- *eteshām¹ visarjanīyo yathāvivṛitam² na bhagate³ yathā⁴ yajñam* ----- *āvīrṇir⁵* (viii 24) *iti prāptih⁶ 'adhvaraviṣhanān nāvrttiḥ⁷ 'adhvaram iti km indr-----' mahā-----* *'kakhapakāra* (viii 23) *iti prāptih⁸ bhūt----- patnīvepatī⁹* (viii 27) *iti¹⁰ prāptih⁸ 'yā-----¹¹ vviçuḥ¹² iti km. parush-----* *punah----- kakhapakāraparah¹³* (viii 23) *ity anayoh prāptih*

¹ G M *ity eteshu* ² G M *-vāthm* ³ G M O *āpadyate* ⁴ G M O om ⁵ G M add *idāh* ⁶ G M om ⁷ B G M om, W O put next before *vviçuḥ* ⁸ *iti km* ⁹ B om ¹⁰ O om *pati*, G M *patishpatim* ¹¹ O *ity ādhā* ¹² W B O put after *mahā* --- ¹³ G M *-çuḥ parur* ¹⁴ G M O om *parah*

33 *sāmnidhyād atra¹ paratra ca² nañartho labhyate. dhaç³ ca shaç⁴ ca dhashāu tāv asmīnt sta iti dhashavat tasmin dhashavati⁵ pade parabhūte sati 'pārvo visarjanīyo' yathāvivṛitam⁶*

bahūparādhi skandāt (II 6 6² and VI 2 8⁵ the same divisions contain each a second example of the compound), *purushahpurusho nāthanam* (VI 6 3² the same division contains a second example of the compound), and *ubhayatahksnūr bhavati* (V 1 1⁴). I have noted besides only *parushahparushah pari* (IV 2 9²). That the word containing *dh* or *sh* must follow the *visarjanīya*, not be the one that itself ends in that letter, is shown by the counter-examples *adhaspadam krnute* (IV 7 13³), and *rtasya jyotishas patim* (I 5 11¹).

परिवाप्ररः ॥३४॥

34 Not before *pari vā* or *pra*

The examples are *rocand divah pari vājeshu* (IV 2 11¹ only G M have the first word)—with the counter-example *divas pari prathamam* (I 3 14⁵ and IV 2 2¹), to show the need of citing *vā* after *pari*—and *tasmād itahpradānam devāh* (III 2 9⁷ O omits *devāh*). Of these, the first is an exception under VIII 28, the other, under VIII 23. There is yet another passage, *bahūprāno vāi manushyah* (VI 1 1⁴), which needs to be brought under the rule, and the commentator accordingly declares that the quotation of *pra* in this rule with short *a* is intended to connote *prā* also—just as, in a rule of the next chapter (IX 24), *athā* connotes *atha* also, by a converse principle. This, however, suggests a difficulty why then is not rule VII.7, prescribing for *prā* an effect which had already been

*nā "padyate yathā⁸ bahūh---- puru---- ubhay----
kakhapakāra⁹ (VIII 23) iti pīṣṭiḥ. parabhūta iti kim adhas-
---- rtasya----¹⁰*

¹ G M ins ca ² G M O ins sūtre ³ G M O dhakāraṣ ⁴ G M O shakā-
raṣ ⁵ B G M O om ⁶ O om, G M purva- ⁷ G M -vidham ⁸ B-G M
O om ⁹ B -rapara ¹⁰ W adds tasminn iti nidishite purvasya parvavaparah

34 *pari vā pra* ¹ *evam paro visarjanīyo yathāvivṛtam² nā*
"padyate rocand---- ve 'ti kim divas---- tasmād-----
pre 'ti hrasvagrahanam dīrghasyā 'py upalakshanam ³ *yatho*
'dathāparaṣ ca (IX 24) *iti dīrghagrahanam hrasvasyo 'pala-*
kshanāntham⁴ tarhi prāpūrvaṣ ca (VII 7) *iti sūtram vyar-*
tham praṣabdasya⁵ 'nuvrttasyā⁶ 'va dīrghopalakshakatvād⁷ iti
cet ucyate pratyakshagrhitasyā⁸ 'vo 'palakshakatvam⁹ nā 'nu-
krśhtasye 'ti vyñeyam ¹⁰ *tathā hi vāhanauhyamānah* (VII 6)
ity atra¹¹ cakārena praṣabdas tatrā 'nukrśhtah atra tu¹² parivā-
prapara¹³ ity ¹⁴ *upalakshakatvam¹⁵ bhavati tathā satī 'dam*
apy uddharanam bahūh----

¹ G M ins ity ² G M -vidham ³ B ins ⁴ here, as well as below, in its
place ⁵ G M O nam, B hrasvop ⁶ G M ins eva ⁷ G M -kshanatvād, O
dīrghagrahanasyop- ⁸ G M -ivāt ⁹ G M om ¹⁰ G M vā ¹¹ G M ins pra-
para it pratyakshagrhitatvād, O ins pratyakshagrhitatvād ¹² G M -kshanam

prescribed for *pra*, a superfluity? Because, is the reply, such connotation is only proper in the case of a word directly cited, not of one that is brought forward by implication merely and in rule vii 6 the *pra* was thus brought forward [from rule 4], in virtue of the *ca*, 'and,' contained in the rule whereas here the *pra* is expressly mentioned. This seems a case of rather questionable interpretation.

न निर्ण निः ॥ ३५ ॥

35 Not so with *nih*

That is, as the commentator explains it, the exception established by the preceding rule does not hold good in the case of *nih*, which is treated as prescribed in rule 24, even before *pra*. The cases instanced in illustration of the rule are both of a doubtful character: the one is a *jatā*-reading, *prāñcāu nir nish prāñcāu prāñcāu nih* (vi 4 10²), the other an extract from the ending of the same *anuvāka* (vi 4 10), *ātmanā parā nish pra çukraçocishā*, these words being those which end respectively the first four divisions of the *anuvāka*. We shall find other quotations of the endings later, and their appearance is at least decisive of the recognition by the commentator of the breaking up of the *anuvākas* into divisions of fifty words each, whatever we may have to believe respecting its recognition by the Prātiçākhyā. We are not, however, to take for granted that even the commentator accepted the division as now made in our manuscripts, involving a suspension of continuity of the *samhitā*-text after each fiftieth word: there was probably at first, a mere enumeration made, with an expression of its results at the end of the *anuvāka*. The endings, as may be seen in the Calcutta edition, are carefully accented, and written according to the rules of combination as laid down by the Prātiçākhyā. The same rules are followed in the *jatā*-text, and hence, as (by rule vii 2, above) *nih* converts the following initial *n* into *n* in *samhitā*, so does it also in the repetitions of the *jatā* (*nir nish*). As a yet farther consequence, it has the same effect in the rules of the Prātiçākhyā, and I have therefore accepted the reading *na* instead of *na* in the repetition of the present rule, although it is supported only by T and W.

35 *nir ity aha visarjanīyasya¹ praparativ² 'pi shatvanishedho na bhavati shatvam eva bhavati 'ty arthah prāñ-.... ātm-*

iti tribhāshyaratne prātiçākhyavivarane³
ashtamo 'dhyāyah

¹ O *niryaḥ* ² O *prapare* ³ O *ins prathamapraçne*

CHAPTER IX

CONTENTS 1-6, treatment of final *h* before initial surd letters, 7-10, treatment of final *ah* and *ah*, 11-15, of final diphthongs before initial vowels, 16-17, of the particle *u*, 18-19, duplication of final *n* and *n*, 20-24, conversion of final *an*, *m*, *un*, to *an*, *unr*, *ūnr*

उष्मपरो ऽघोषपरे लुप्यते काण्डमायनस्य ॥१॥

1 *Visarjanīya*, when followed by a spirant which has a surd letter after it, is dropped, according to Kādamāyana

The commentator, after a brief paraphrase of the rule, gives a couple of examples to illustrate its working namely, *catustanām karoti* (v 1 6⁴, p *catuh-standām*), and *vāyava stho 'pāyava stha* (1 1 1). The mention of Kādamāyana is declared to be made on account of a difference of views others, namely, hold that *h* is dropped before a spirant that is followed by a sonant letter as well, as *adbhya svāhā* (1 8 13³), *ye guklā syus tam* (1 3 1³ W B omit *tam*), *yo hatamamā svayampāpah* (1 2 8³ O omits *yo*, G M omit *pāpah*), and *dānakāmā me prayā syuh* (1 2 8³, 3 4¹ O omits the first word, G M, the first two) I am not sure that I understand the consideration further alleged, in view of which it is decided that "the rule is all right," it appears to be that, reference having thus been made to a discordance of views, those words will be hereafter specified in which there is omission made under any other prescription—but what this refers to, I am unable to see

Every MS that I have reads '*ghoshaparo* as second word in the rule but the comment so plainly implies the reading *-pare*, and the sense so obviously requires it, that I have ventured its adoption

Although the prescription here given is put upon the authority of an individual, it is pretty evidently to be regarded as definitely

1 *ūshmaparō visarjanīyah kādamāyanasya mate lupyate tasminn ūshmany aghoshavatpare¹ sati yathā catu-.... vāy-.... kādamāyanagrahanam² vikalpārtham anyeshām mate ghoshavatpare³ py ūshmani visarjanīyo lupyate yathā adbhya-.... ye-.... yo-.... dāna-.... evam ca vikalpāgrahane⁴ sati lakshanāntaragatam⁵ yeshu padeshu lupyate tāni padāni vakshyāma⁶ iti vacanam saralam bhavati*

ūshma paro yasmād 'asāv ūshmaparah⁷ na ghoshavān aghoshah asāv⁸ paro yasmāt 'sa tathoktah⁹ tasminn aghoshapare

¹ G M O om *vai* ² G M -yanasya gr- ³ W -grahane, O -grahagrahane, G M -lpanāre ⁴ W O -nātara- ⁵ G M O prav ⁶ G M sa tatho 'ktah ⁷ G M om ⁸ G M om

adopted and taught by the Prātiçākhyā, and is usually (not without occasional exceptions) conformed to by the edition of the Sanhitā, and by my manuscripts both of that and of the Prātiçākhyā and its commentary I have, therefore, treated it as peremptory, and have everywhere governed by it the readings I have accepted. The same omission is prescribed by the Rik and Vājasaneyi Prātiçākhyas, but not by the Atharvan (see Ath Pr ii 40, note)

अधोषपरस्तस्य सस्थानमूष्माणम् ॥ २ ॥

2 Followed by a surd letter, it becomes the spirant of like position with that letter

The commentator's examples are *yax kāmāyeta* (ii 1 2³ et al, O reads -yate), *agnis ca me* (iv 7 6¹ O omits this and the next example), *ulākaç çaçah* (v 5 18), *agnis te teyah* (i 1 10³ and vii 5 17 O leaves out te), and *yax pāpmanā grhītaḥ* (ii 1 3⁵, 4⁶ W leaves off the first word, G M O omit the last)

The requirements of this rule are by no means complied with by the manuscripts, nor have I followed them in the present work. In the first place, no manuscript that I possess, or have ever seen, attempts to represent any such sounds as the *jhvāmāliya* and *upādhmānīya* (see i 9), or *z* and *ç*, for these, *visarjanīya* is universally substituted, as if the sect of Āgniveçya and Vālmīki (see rule 4, below) had supplanted all its rivals, and, in the second place, the agreement to leave *visarjanīya* unchanged before a sibilant (according to the view of the authorities referred to below, in rule 5) is nearly as general. In my MS of the Sanhitā, I have noted about thirty cases of conversion to a sibilant, in place of unchanged retention, and they are nearly all in a single limited neighborhood (in iv 5), where a different scribe has developed his originality a little. As is hinted above, in the introduction, however, G and M make with great regularity the assimilation of *h* to the following sibilant, O does it not infrequently, the others, almost never.

I have put together, in the note to Ath Pr ii 40, a statement of the variously conflicting views respecting the treatment of *h* before the different classes of surd letters held by the different Prātiçākhyas, or referred to in their rules, and it is unnecessary to repeat it here. The sole point upon which all authorities agree is the conversion into *ç* and *s* before palatal and dental mutes respectively—and this is also the only point left unquestioned by the rules which follow here in our treatise.

न क्षपरः ॥ ३ ॥

2 *aghoshaparo visarjanīyas tasyāḥ 'ghoshasya sasthanam ūshmanam bhagate yax----* 'agnis---- *ulā-----* 'agnis---- *yax-----*

(1) O om

3 But not when followed by *ksh*

That is to say, *visarjanīya* remains unchanged before *ksh*, the preceding rule for its conversion to *jihvāmūliya* being annulled. There is nothing corresponding to the usage here prescribed in either of the other treatises. The commentator quotes a number of examples: *manah ksheme* (v 2 1⁷), *ubhayataḥkshnūr bhavati* (v 1 1⁴). W B omits *bhavati* the *visarjanīya* was exempted from conversion into *s* before the *k* by viii 33), *ghanāghanah kshobhanah* (iv 6 4¹), *pū vo 'śhtuh kshīyate* (iii 1 7¹), and *dyāuh kshāmā rerihat* (iv 2 1²). O omits the last word.

कपवर्गपरश्चाग्निवेश्याल्मीक्योः ॥ ४ ॥

4 Nor, according to Āgṇiveṣya and Vālmīki, when followed by a guttural or a labial mute

The two authorities here specified (the commentator calls them "holders of a *śākhā*, teachers"), it appears, reject altogether the *jihvāmūliya* and *upadhmānīya*, since they prescribe the retention of *visarjanīya* in the only situations where those problematical sounds are liable to arise. The commentator quotes a couple of illustrative passages: *yah kāmāyeta* (ii 1 2³ et al), and *agnih paçur āsīt* (v 7 26). O has dropped out what follows *agnih*. Then, to show that on other points these heterodox persons accept our rule 2, he cites *madhuç ca mādhuvaç ca* (i 4 14 and iv 4 11¹), *manas tatvāya* (iv 1 1¹) but B substitutes *namas talpyāya*, iv 5 9¹), *āçuç śiçānah* (iv 6 4¹), *yas somam iami* (ii 3 2⁶).

उष्मपर एवैकेषामाचार्याणाम् ॥ ५ ॥

5 According to some authorities, not when followed by a spirant, and only then

I believe there can be no real doubt as to the meaning of this rule, although it is not very explicitly interpreted by the commen-

3 *kshaparo visarjanīyah pūrvavidham na bhagate yathā¹ man----- ubhay----- ghanā----- pūrv----- dyāuh----- kshakārasya² 'ghoshavattvāt prāptih*

¹ G M O om

4 ¹ *cakāro nishedham ākarshati āgṇiveṣyavālmīkyoh¹ śākhānor ācāryayor² mate³ 'kavargaparah pavargaparo vā⁴ pūrvavidham⁵ 'nā⁶ padhyate⁷ yah----- agnih⁸----- kakāraç ca pakāraç ca kapāu tayor vargāu⁹ kapavargāu tāu parāu yaśmāt sa tathoktā evampara iti kum madhuç----- manas----- āçuç----- yas-----*

(¹) G M om, O *caçabdo nañākarshakah āgn-* (²) O om (³) O *kapavargaparo visarjanīyah* (⁴) O *na bhagate*. (⁵) O *kavargaç ca pavargaç ca*

tator, and although G M O omit the negative in the interpretation (I presume, by a copyist's blunder only) Some authorities, who do not, like Āgñivegya and Vālmīki, refuse to accept the *ṛhvāmāṇīya* and *upadhmanīya*, nevertheless deny the doctrine of rule 2 to this extent—that they prescribe the retention of *visarjanīya*, not its assimilation, before a sibilant Thus, they would write *āḥuḥ ḡḥānāḥ* (iv 6 4¹) G M, as is their constant custom, write here *āḥuḥ*, and so does O, as is its common, though far from invariable, usage but this means nothing, for we have no good reason to expect the manuscripts of the commentary to conform themselves in any such case to a reading which will truly illustrate the matter in hand, they simply make the *sandhi* in the manner usual with them for example, under rule 2, no MS attempts to indicate the *ḡ* and *ḥ*, and W B give the *h* instead of the sibilant before the sibilant

If we reject this interpretation, our sole alternative is, so far as I can see, to hold that some authorities would accept rule 2 only so far as it relates to *h* before a sibilant, but would retain *h* everywhere else, even reading *agnih te tejah*, *agnih ca me* This seems altogether inadmissible Yet we must acknowledge that it is to some extent favored by the commentator's selection of counter-examples, namely *manas tatvāya* (iv 11¹ but B substitutes again *namas tatpāya*, iv 5 9¹), and *yah kāmāyeta* (ii 1 2³ et al) According to our preferred interpretation, there would be no particular reason for quoting the former of these, since the combination it illustrates has been made a question by no one according to the other, it would be required (in the form *manah tatvāya*), to show what these dissidents held should be done in such a case

न प्राक्षिप्राक्षायणयोः ॥ ६ ॥

6 Not according to Plākshī and Plākshāyana

The natural interpretation of this rule would seem to be, that Plākshī and Plākshāyana are not of the number of those who hold the objectionable doctrine of the last rule, or of the last two rules If, however, I rightly apprehend the commentator, he declares it

5 *ekeshām ācāryānām mata ūshmapara eva visarjanīyah pūrvaviddhim na¹ bhagate yathā² āḥuḥ---- evakārena kim manas----³ yaḥ----⁴*

¹ G M O om ² G M O om ³ G M om

6 *kapavargapara¹ ūshmaparaḥ ca visarjanīyah plākshīplākshāyanayoh śākhinoḥ² pakṣhe na khalu pūrvaviddhim bhagate yaḥ---- yaḥ---- āḥuḥ---- evampara itī kim manas----³ kapavargādī sūtratrāyaṃ anishtaṃ⁴*

¹ O *kavargaparah pavargaparaḥ ca* ² G M om ³ G M prefix *evam*, and put the whole at the end of the comment on the preceding rule, they also omit rule 6

to mean "in the opinion of these two authorities, it does not—that is, *h* does not follow the prescription of rule 2 either before a guttural or palatal mute or before a spirant" This is equivalent to a ratification of rule 4, and a ratification or rejection of rule 5, according as we adopt the one or the other of the two interpretations proposed for the latter, and it is, in my view, quite unsuited to the connection. The discordant explanations of some of the other views of designated authorities given in the rules of the treatise show us that the commentators had not in all cases, at least, any certain knowledge by tradition of the matters referred to, but simply interpreted as well as they were able the notices of their text-book—and we have the same right as they in this respect. If the particular point here under discussion were of more practical consequence, I should be inclined to go into a fuller discussion of it, as the case stands, it has perhaps cost us already more words than it is worth.

The commentator illustrates by repeating several of the quotations already given—namely *yah kāmayeta* (ii 1 2^s et al), *yah pāpmanā* (ii 1 3^s et al), *ācuh śiśānah* (iv 6 4¹) these as direct examples, as counter-example, according to W O, *manas tatvāya* (iv 1 1¹), for which B once more substitutes *namas tatpyāya* (iv 5 9¹), while G M read *agnis ca me* (iv 7 6¹)—the readings of which, as regards the *visarjanīya*, each manuscript gives in its usual fashion (except that W has this time *ācuh śiśānah*, by a blundering divergence in the wrong direction), so that we are deprived of any farther aid from that quarter to the understanding of the rule.

Finally, rules 4–6 are declared not approved.

ओकारमः सर्वे ङ्कारपरः ॥ ७ ॥

7 *Ah*, the whole of it, when followed by *a*, becomes *o*

The commentator's cited examples are *predhho agne* (iv 6 5⁴ and v 4 7³), *samidhho aṅgan* (v 1 11¹), and so 'bravit' (ii 1 2¹ et al). He then enters into a long exposition intended to prove the necessity of the specification *sarvah*, 'the whole of it,' in the rule. Without it, we are told, the reading *samidhho aṅgan* (in the second example given) would not be established for, by 156, alteration and omission concern only a single letter, hence, if *sarvah* were omitted, only the final *visarjanīya* would be converted to *o*, this, with the preceding *a*, would become *āu* by x 7, the *āu* would

7 *ahsarvo visarjanīya*¹ *otvam*² *bhagate* 'kāraparah³ *ahsarva*
*ity akārena sahe*⁴ 'ty arthah pre---- sam---- so---- ah-
*sarva iti kim samiddho aṅgan iti na sīdhyet*⁵ *kim tu var-*
nasya vikāralopāv (156) *iti visarjanīyamātrasya syāt*
otvam tata okārāukāraparah (x 7) *ity āukāre kṛta āukāra*
āvam (ix 15) *ity āvādeṣah tathā sati*⁶ *samidhāv aṅgan iti*
syāt 'yad vā⁷ ⁸ *svaraparo yakāram* (ix 10) *iti yatvam* ⁹

be converted into *āv* by ix 15, and the final reading would be *sam-iddhāv añjan*. Or, again [supposing the present rule not to be given], the *visarjanīya* would become *y* by ix 10, the *y* would be dropped by x 19, the preceding *a* would be exempted from further combination by x 25, and the *samhitā*-reading would turn out *samiddhā añjan*.

The Ath Pr (ii 53) avoids the same difficulty by prescribing the conversion of the *h* into *u*, which then combines with the preceding *a* into *o*. The other treatises (Rik Pr ii 12, Vāj Pr iv 42) treat the combination in the same manner as our own. What becomes of the following *a* is taught in the eleventh and twelfth chapters.

घोषवत्परश्च ॥ ८ ॥

8 Also when followed by a sonant consonant

Only one example of this combination is cited, namely *mā no mitro varunah* (iv 6 8¹ G M O omit the last word)

The commentator raises against this rule the objection that, as prescribing the same thing with the one preceding, it should not have been made a separate rule at all, and, in reply, he promises that the exposition of the meaning of *tu* in the next rule shall explain the reason of the proceeding.

अवर्णपूर्वस्तु लुप्यते ॥ ९ ॥

9 But *visarjanīya*, when preceded by an *a*-vowel, is omitted

In these rules, from 7 to 10 inclusive, the *anuvrtti*, or continuance of implication, is intricate and irregular in an unusual degree, and even beyond the measure of what ought to be tolerated. The implication of *visarjanīya* being made all the way from viii 5 to

bhavati tasmāñ ca lupyete tv avarnapūrvāu yavakā āv
(x 19) *iti yakāre*¹⁰ *lupte pa a ca para ca* (x 25) *iti*¹¹ *kāryānta-*
*rāprasiddhe*¹² *samiddhā*¹³ *añjan ity syāt tan mā bhād ity*¹⁴
¹⁵*evam arthah*¹⁶ *ahsarva*¹⁶ *ity uktam*

¹ G M om, and ins *apy* ² G M *okāram* ³ G M put at the beginning
⁴ G M *sahito visarjanīya* ⁵ O *sūhyati* ⁶ B G M om ⁷ G M *km ca*, O
km tu ⁸ G M O ins *atitha* ⁹ G M O ins *vā* ¹⁰ G M O om ¹¹ O ins
sūtreṇa ¹² G M *prasakte*, O *prasakth tathā sat* ¹³ W *dāho*, B *dāhau*
¹⁴ G M om ¹⁵ G M O om, B om. *evam* ¹⁶ B om *ah*

8 *cakāra*¹ *okāram ahsarvam cā 'nvādiṣati* *ah*² *sarvo ghosha-*
*vatpara*³ *otvam bhagate yathā*⁴ *mā----* *nanu vidhīu samāne*
*prthakkaranam*⁵ *anarthakam itī cet uttarasūtre tuṣābdavyākhyā-*
*nena*⁶ *sphutīkarīṣhyata*⁷ *iti parihārah*

¹ G M put next before *anvādiṣati* ² O om ³ G M O *ra ca* ⁴ G M O
om ⁵ G M *-ksūtrak* ⁶ G M *lhyane* ⁷ W O *-shya*

ix 10 (as pointed out in the comment to viii 5), rule 7 of this chapter ought to teach that "*visarjanīya*, when preceded by *a*, becomes *o* along with the latter, when *a* follows" instead of which a new subject, "the whole syllable *ah*," is introduced there, and *visarjanīya*, being thus replaced by something else in rules 7 and 8, ought to drop out of view altogether, or, if needed further, to be distinctly specified over again. But we find it implied without specification in the present rule, and, farther, the being followed by a sonant consonant is brought down "by vicinage" from rule 8, while the *tu*, 'but,' the commentator says, merely annuls the being followed by *a*, as specified in rule 7. This is little less than absurd if the sequence of *a* was to be annulled at all, it should have been so in rule 8—or, rather, it was annulled by rule 8, and needs to be made no further account of. The *tu* is here, as often elsewhere, a simple sign of a change of subject, and the commentator's attempt to give it a precise significance is—also, as often elsewhere—a failure. Our rule means, by its terms, that *ah*, *āh*, and *āsh* lose then *h* before a sonant consonant, only, as *ah* was already specially provided for by rule 8, it virtually applies only to *āh* and *āsh*. The statement is thus made more general than is needed for the case in hand, because the whole implication of "preceded by an *a*-vowel" is needed for rule 10, which is to teach that *ah*, *āh*, and *āsh* before a vowel—here, again, with the exception of *ah* before *a*, already provided for—convert then *h* into *y*, preliminary to dropping it altogether, by x 19. But rule 10 presents a more anomalous combination of two heterogeneous matters into one precept than is easily to be paralleled elsewhere in the Pratiśakhyā. It is really made up of two independent parts: one, *atha svarāparāḥ*, 'Now then, when followed by a vowel,' which is an introductory heading having force through this chapter and the next, the other, *visarjanīyo yakāram*, '*h* becomes *y*,' and then combination is made in order that the implication of *visarjanīya* and also of *avar-napārva* may be made from what precedes, and may not require to be distinctly stated.

The commentator's examples of the application of the rule are *devā gātuvīdāḥ* (i 1 13², 4 44³ vi 6 2³), and *vicityāḥ somās na vicitryās itī* (vi 1 9¹, *somās* for *somāś*, by protraction from *somah* G M omit the last two words, O the last three). He adds, as his exposition of the connection of the rule, that the express spe-

9 *avarṇapārvo ghoshavatparas tu¹ visarjanīyo lupyate hras-vapūrvasyāu 'kāra' eva dīrghapūrvasya² plutapūrvasya ca lopah yathā. devā---- viṣ---- okāram ah sarvo 'kāraparāḥ* (ix 7) *ity akāraparatvam pratyaksham tuṣabdena nivartyā³ "nu-mānikam ghosharatparatvam paragrhyate sāmnyādhyāt asyā⁴ 'nuvartanam evā¹ bhāṣitam atre² 'tī pūrvasūtradvayasya⁴ prthak-karanam*

¹ W ins *sah* ² B G M *vikāra* ³ B *rva*, O *-gha* ⁴ G M *trasya*

ification of sequence by *a*, made in rule 7, is annulled by the word *tu*, and that an inferential sequence by a sonant consonant is assumed by vicinage [from rule 8], and that the implication here of the latter only is the reason why rules 7 and 8 are given independently of one another. That is to say, such is the easiest way of arriving at the result desired, that the *h* of *āh* and *āzh* is not directly dropped before *a*, but passes through the intermediate step of conversion into *y*, as before the other vowels

अथ स्वरपरो यकारम् ॥ १० ॥

10 When followed by a vowel, it becomes *y*

That is to say, *visarjanīya* does so, if preceded by an *a*-vowel (rule 9)—except in the case of *ah* followed by *a* (rule 7). And, as is intimated by the prefixion of *atha*, the specification “followed by a vowel” is of force also in the following rules (through chapter x). I have remarked in the preceding note upon the anomalousness of this rule, as striving to fuse into one the winding-up of one subject and the introduction of another. It has not seemed possible to render the *atha* excepting by a longer and more tedious paraphrase than I was willing to introduce, accordingly, I have left it out in translating the precept.

The commentator's examples are *āpa undantu jivase* (1 2 1¹ G M O omit *jivase*), *tā abruvan* (1 3 5², 5 1⁵), and *anvārabhyās iti* (1 3 8¹, *anvārabhyās* for *anvārabhyāsh*, by protraction from *anvārabhyah*), and he gives further, as counter-examples, *āpo varunasya* (1 5 4¹ a not unexceptionably selected example, since *āpah* even before a vowel might not follow the present rule), and *agnir ekāksharena* (1 7 11¹ a case under VIII 6, as the preceding under 1 8).

This conversion of *visarjanīya* into *y* is only the preliminary step to its complete loss, by rule x 19. The same course of conversion is followed by the Atharvan and Vājasaneyi Prātīcākhyas (Ath Pr 11 41, Vaj Pr 14 36), but not by that of the Rik (11 9, 10).

एकारो ज्यम् ॥ ११ ॥

11 *E*, before a vowel, becomes *ay*

10 'athagabdo 'dhikārārthah' svarah paro yasmād asāt svaraparah ita uttaram yad ucyate' svarapara ity evam tati namitvatvend' dhikrtam veditavyam' sāmnydhyād avarnapārva' iti labhyate. svaraparo visarjanīyo 'varnapārvo' yalāram' āpad-yate yathā⁵ āpa---- tā---- anvā----- svarapara iti kim āpo---- avarnapārva iti kim agnir----

⁽¹⁾ G M athe 'ty ayaṁ adhikarah, O karah ² O so 'yam ³ G M vakshyāmah ⁴ G M O jñātavyam ⁵ O om purva ⁶ G M put before svaraparo ⁷ O yatvam ⁸ O om

Of which, then, the *y* is lost by x 19, leaving only *a*, and this, by x 25, is not liable to further combination. The commentator's examples are *ima evā 'smāi* (11 4 10³), and *ta enam bhishagyantri* (11 3 11⁴).

ओकारो ऽवम् ॥ १२ ॥

12 *O* becomes *av*

The example is *viṣṇav e 'hī 'dam* (11 4 12³). For the further treatment of the *v* thus produced, see x 19 and the following rules

नाकारपरौ ॥ १३ ॥

13 But not, in either case, when followed by *a*

The dual number of the attribute in this rule, we are told, sufficiently shows that the two letters *e* and *o*, last mentioned, are its subject. There are two different rules in the treatise applying to the case of a final *e* or *o* coming to stand before initial *a*—namely rule 11, above [or rule 12], and rule xi 1, which directs that the latter shall be elided—and, since the rules of this chapter are of paramount force, as preceding the other, the present precept is required in order to annul them.

The commentator's examples are *mā te asyām* (16.12⁵), *samīdho aṅgan* (v 1 11¹), and *te 'bruvan* (11 5 1³ et al.)

ऐकार आयम् ॥ १४ ॥

14 *Āi* becomes *āy*

11 'visrsh̥to visarjanāyāh¹ idam² idānīm ucyate svanaparah̥ padānta³ ekaro 'yam iti vikāram āpadyate ima---- ta--

⁽¹⁾ G M visargo murtāh, O visargo vinirgatah ⁽²⁾ G M om ⁽³⁾ W -tah, B -te

12 svaraparah¹ padānta okāro 'vam iti² vikāram āpadyate yathā³ viśh----

⁽¹⁾ G M svarah ⁽²⁾ B G M O om ⁽³⁾ W B G M om

13 dvivacanasāmarthyagrhitāv¹ ekārārūḥā dv akāraparāu² pārvavidhūm³ na prāpnutah yathā⁴ mā---- sam---- te ---- ity ādāv ekāi o 'yam (ix 11) ⁽⁵⁾ lupyate tv akāra ekārārūḥārapā vah (xi 1) iti ⁽⁶⁾ sūtradvayam prasaktam tatā 'pi pārvatvāt pibalan⁷ yatvavidhūm nisheddhum ayam ārambhah akārah paro yābhyām tāv akāraparāu

⁽¹⁾ B G M O -thyāt gr-, and G M O add sannihitav ⁽²⁾ G M O om ⁽³⁾ G M om ⁽⁴⁾ G M om ⁽⁵⁾ G M ins it ca, O ins it ⁽⁶⁾ G M O ins ca ⁽⁷⁾ O ins ekārasya

The example is *āsāmahā eve 'māu dvādaśāu māśāu* (vii 5 2¹ B omits the last word, G M O the last two)

To complete the *sandhi*, also, which is the subject of this rule and its successor, rule x 19 is needed

औकार आवम् ॥ १५ ॥

15 *Āv* becomes *āv*

The example is *ahāv anadātā hate* (v 6 1²)

उकारो ऽपृक्तः प्रकृत्या वकारो ऽन्तरे ॥ १६ ॥

16 An *u*, uncombined with a consonant, remains unchanged, and *v* is inserted between it and the following vowel

The definition of *aprkta* was given above, at 154, and such a word was directed to be treated both as initial and as final (155) This rule makes an exception for the particle *u*, which becomes *uv* before a vowel—which, moreover, never occurs after an *a*-vowel except as combined with it, forming part of the class of *pragrahas* in *o* which were treated above, in rules iv 6, 7 The examples given are *sa uv ekaviṅśavartanā* (iv 3 3²), and *adanty uv evā'sya manushyāh* (ii 3 7⁴) I have noted further only iv 6 9⁴, but am not sure that I have been careful to mark all the cases As counter-examples, *svapatyāya deva* (v 5 4⁴, p *su-apatyāya*) shows that the *u* must be *aprkta*, and *bhakshe* " *hā* (iii 2 5¹), that no other *aprkta* vowel than *u* is thus treated

न तत्तस्मात्साङ्गितः ॥ १७ ॥

17 But not in *saṅghatā*-text, after *tat* and *tasmāt*

The passages are *tad v āhur utsryam* (vii 5 7¹ O omits after *āhur*), and *tasmād v āgyam* (vi 1 11⁶) So far as I have observed, these are the only instances which the text affords of *u* following

14 *svaraparāh padānta*¹ *ākāra āyam vikāram āpadyate yathā*² *āsām---*

¹ B G M -*nle* ² G M O om

15 *ākārah padānta*¹ *svarapara*² *āvam vikāram āpadyate yathā*³ *ahāv----*

¹ B -*nle* ² G M invert the order ³ G M O om

16 *aprktaśamyāka*¹ *ukārah svaraparāh*² *prakṛtyā 'vatish-thate avikṛto*³ *bhavatī 'ty arthah ukārasvarayor antare 'vakāray cā* " *gamo*⁴ *bhavatī yathā*⁵ *sa----* *adanty----* *aprkta ite kim* *sva----* *ukāra ite kim bhak----*

¹ G M *gña* ⁽²⁾ G M *ukarasvah* ³ G M *kāro* ⁽⁴⁾ O *vakarag* ⁵ W B G M om

a consonant and preceding a vowel. Compare the similar rules in the other treatises (Rik Pr 11 28, Vāj Pr 14 87, Ath P1 11 36). The preceding precept being thus annulled with reference to these two cases, they fall under the general rule x 15, and the *u*, like any final, is converted into *v*. To show the bearing of the specification *sāmhatah*, 'in combined text,' the commentator gives us the two passages in *pada* and *krama* form thus—*tat u āhuh tad u uv āhuh āhur utsryam* (but G M O give simply the first two *krama pada*'s), and *tasmāt u āgyam tasmād u uv āgyam* (here only W has the statement in *pada*). It thus appears that the combination with the preceding consonant is indispensable to the treatment of the *u* as here prescribed, failing that, it falls under the preceding rule, and becomes *uv*.

ह्रस्वपूर्वो ऊकारो द्विवर्णम् ॥ १८ ॥

18 A *ū*, when preceded by a short vowel, is doubled

That is to say, when another vowel follows—the heading *atha svaraparāh* (ix 10) still continuing in force. The commentator adds also "when occurring at the end of a *pada*," as he has done in his paraphrase of the preceding rules. This is a matter of course, as we are dealing only with the conversion of *pada*-text into *samhitā*. His illustrative examples are *nyāññ agnih* (v 5 3²), and *tam u tvā dadhyāññ rshah* (iv 1 3² and v 1 4⁴ only G M have the first two words). That the preceding vowel must be short, he shows by *parāñ ā vātate* (iii 2 9⁷ and vi 3 8³), that a vowel must follow, by *sadrñk samāndūh syāt* (ii 2 8⁶ only O has the last word, only B G M have the inserted *k*, required by v 32, and G M convert it to *kh*, by xiv 12), and *pratyāñk shad-ahah* (vii 4 2⁵ here all have the *k*, but only G M make it *kh*).

17 *tat tasmād ity*¹ *etābhyān sāmhata uktāro 'prktaḥ pūrvavi-dhūn nā* "pnoti"² *prakṛtyāvasthānam vakāraḥ*³ *ca na bhavati* 'ty *arthah tad----* *tasmād----* *varnokaṛāu yavakāṛāv* (x 15) *iti daḥame*⁴ 'sya' *vidhur vakshyate*⁵ *tat tasmāt sāmhata iti kim tat----* *tasm-----*

¹ G M om. ² G M "padhyate, O prapn- ³ G M O -ragamaḥ ⁴ O -ma ⁵ B *tasya* ⁶ O ins *tasya purastādapavādo 'yam*

18 'svaraparo naktārah padāntavartī hrasvapūrvō¹ dvivarnam² *bhagate yathā*³ *nyāññ----* *tam----* *hrasvapūrva iti kim par-----* *svapara iti kim sad-----* *praty-----* *hrasvah pūrvo yasmād asāu hrasvapūrvah dvayor varnayoḥ samāhāro dvivarnam*

(¹) G M arrange *hr-sv-pad nak-* ² G M O ins *dvivarnam* ³ G M om

नकारश्च ॥ १९ ॥

19 As does also a *n*

The *a* in this rule brings down, we are told, the preceding cause of duplication and the duplication itself. The cited examples are *nir avapann vidrāya* (ii 4 2²), and *abruvann rdhnvat* (i 5 1²). The counter-examples, given for the same purposes as those under the preceding rule, are *niravapan yāny eva puras-tāt* (ii 4 1² O omits the last two words), *omanvati te smin* (ii 6 9⁵ O omits the last word), *yān agnayo 'nvatapyanta* (iii 2 8³ O omits the last word, G M omits the whole example), and *vidvān etam agnim cinute* (v 6 5³). The commentator does not give himself the trouble this time to inquire why two rules are furnished to prescribe a single process: the reason is, evidently, because continued implication of *n* only is desired in the rules that follow.

अनितिपरो ग्रहोऽव्याख्यापृथक्प्रत्ययवर्णविधीकारो- कारपूर्वी रेफमाकारपूर्वश्च यकारम् ॥ २० ॥

20 In *graha*, *ukhya*, *yāgyā*, *prsthya*, and *hiranyavarṇīya* passages, a *n* preceded by *i* or *ū* becomes *r*, preceded by *ā* becomes *y*, except before *iti*.

The remainder of the chapter is occupied with rules respecting these conversions of a final *n* after *ā*, *i*, and *ū* before an initial vowel—conversions of which the original ground is the same with that which causes the combinations *ñcc*, *ñst* to result from the collision of *n* with *c* and *t* (vi 20, vi 14), namely the partial retention of an original *s* which followed the *n* as part of the declensional *śācy* on *śā* the word. See note to Ath Pr ii 27 for a full statement of the teachings of the other Prācākhyas respecting this. The conversion of *n* to *y* is equivalent to its omission, since *y* is dropped by x 19. Rules xv 1–3 are also needed to correct the combinations intended, by the nasalization of the pre-*ceding* vowel, or the insertion of *anuvāra* after it.

19 *cakārah pūrvanām, tam¹ dvitvam cā 'nvādigati hrasva-
pūrvō nakāro dvyaṇnam² bhayate³ svaraparah nir---- abr-
---- evamparag³ iti kim, nir---- oman---- evampūrva iti
kim yān---- vid---*

¹ G M *puruṣtam* ² G M O *dvitvam* ³ G M *āpadyate*

20 *grahokhyādīshu¹ viśhayeshu īkārapū va īkārapūrvō vā ca-
kārdīrshto nakāro 'nakāpa² a³ itivyatīrktasvaraparo³ rep³ham āpa-
dyate īkārapūrvac³ ced yakāram graho nāma caturo 'nvā-*

As in other similar cases, the commentator, after his preliminary paraphrase of the rule, proceeds first to define the passages of the Sanhita designated by the titles it contains. By *graha* is meant the fourth chapter of the first book, excepting its last four sections—or 14 1-42. By *ukhya*, the first two chapters of the "Agni" book (see III 9), excepting their final sections (which are *yāgyā*)—or IV 1 1-10, 2 1-10. The *yāgyās* have been already defined (III 9, note), as the concluding sections of all the chapters to book fourth, chapter third, together with II 6 11. By *prsththya* are intended nine sections, pointed out by the citation of the first words of each: they are IV 4 12, 6 6-9, 7 15 V 1 11, 2 11, 2 12. *Hiranyavarnīya* designates only a single section, V 6 1. Examples are then given from each set of passages. From *graha* passages, we have *jahṣatī āñr āpa mrdho nudasva* (14 42), and *marutvāñ indra vrshabhah* (14 19. G M O omit the last word) there are four other cases, at 14 20 twice, 21, 41. From *ukhya* passages, *ye vā vanaspatīñ annu* (IV 2 8³), and *madhumāñ astu sānyah* (IV 2 9³) there are ten others, at IV 1 3³ twice, 9^{2,3}, 10^{2,4}, 2 4^{2,5}, 9⁵ twice. From *yāgyā* passages, *rtūñr rtupate yage 'ha* (IV 3 13⁴ only O has the last two words), to which W B O add *amavāñ vāhena* (12 14¹), but for this G M substitute *madhumāñ indriyāvāñ* (III 1 10²), which is not in a *yāgyā* passage at all, but falls under the next rule. I have noted more than thirty other cases, namely at 1 1 14⁴, 2 14², 3 14³, 4 46², 5 11², 6 12⁴, 7 13^{4,5} 11 11⁵ thrice, 2 12^{3,8}, 3 14^{2,6}, 6 11¹ thrice ⁴ twice, 12^{1,3} III 1 11¹ thrice, ⁷, 2 11³ twice, 4 11³, 5 11² IV 2 11³, 3 13^{2,3,4} twice. The same passages contain five exceptions, which are duly provided for in rules 23 and 24, below. From *prsththya* passages, the examples are *catī āñr unapavyayantah* (IV 6 6³) and *jaghmadñ upa jaghnate* (IV 6 6⁵) other cases at IV 6 7⁵, 9⁴ twice, 7 15⁷ V 1 11⁴. Finally,

*kān⁴ varjayitvā 'dāde gī āvā⁵ (14 1¹) iti praṣṇah agnikāndra-
syā⁶ 'dyaṃ praṣṇadvayam uttamānuvākavarjam ukhyam⁷ ākhyā-
yate ukta⁸ yāgyāh samid dīśām (IV 4 12¹) jīmūtasya
(IV 6 6¹) yad akrandah (IV 6 7¹) mā no mitrah (IV 6 8¹) ye
vājīnam (IV 6 9¹) agner manve (IV 7 15¹) samiddho añjan
(V 1 11¹) gāyatrī (V 2 11¹) kas tvā (V 2 12¹) ity anuvākanava-
kam⁹ prsththyaṃ iti pathyate¹⁰ hiranyavarṇāh (V 6 1¹) ity
anuvāko hiranyavarṇīyah 'grahe yathā¹¹ jahṣ-.... mar-....
ukhye ye.... madh-.... yāgyāsu rtūñr.... ama-....
prsththye śatr-.... jagh-.... hiranyavarṇīye agnīñr....
sarv-.... anutipara iti kum abhy-.... idā-.... grahādī-
shv iti kum trīn-.... paśūn-.... tām-....*

itih paro yasmād asāv utiparah ne 'tiparo 'nutiparah

¹ G M read *grh-* throughout ² B om ³ G M O *ity etasmad anyasvar-*, B *iti 'ty etad asmad anyas-* ⁴ G M O *'nityanuv-* ⁵ G M. *-vā 's-* ⁶ G M O *ins* ⁷ G M *anuvākh-* ⁸ W O *pachyate*, G M *pathyante* ⁹ G M om

from the *haranyavarnīya* section, *agnīr apśushadah* (v 6 1²), and *sarvāñ agnīn* (v 6 1²), which are the only cases. Counter examples, of *n* not converted as here prescribed, because occurring outside the passages specified, are *trīn mām lokān iti* (vii 3 2¹), *pa-ṣān evā 'va rundhe* (v 1 1¹ et al), and *tān indro 'ntaryāmenā 'ntar adhatta* (vi 4 6¹). G M O omit the last two words). And the bearing of the specification "except before *iti*" is illustrated by examples from the *krama* and *pāda* texts, namely *abhyavartanta dasyān dasyān iti dasyān* (i 6 12⁶, *dasyān* is thus repeated, as being the closing word of the *anuvāka* but W O omit this repetition, which exhibits the very point requiring illustration, and B adds only *iti dasyān* to the first *dasyān*), and *idāvān iti 'dā vān* (iii 1 11¹, *samhitā*-reading, *idāvāñ esha*)

Any general examination of the aspect of this mode of combination in the Tāttvīya text I defer to the end of the chapter

मर्त्यानुद्यानमृतान्दुर्यानसोमपूर्वःसोमस्मानविमानो-
मान्मधुमान्हविष्मान्द्रुतमानार्षेचिकिवानिडावान्कक्षी-
वान्बाणवान्हिपयस्वान्वशान्विदत्रानमित्रानरान्योषा-
न्महाश्च ॥ २१ ॥

21 Also in the words *martyān*, *ud ayān*, *amrtān*, *ḍuryān* not preceded by *soma*, so *asmān*, *avimān*, *gomān*, *madhumān*, *havishmān*, *hūtamān* before any vowel belonging to the text, *cakṣvān*, *idāvān*, *kakshīvān*, *bānavān*, *hi payasvān*, *vacān*, *vidatṛān*, *amitrān*, *arān*, *poshān*, and *mahān*

The *ca* in this rule, says the commentator, brings down from the preceding rule the specification "except before *iti*," but we might fairly claim that it involves all the specifications there made excepting the restriction to certain passages this exception the comment duly notes "this and the rules that follow have a general application, without regard to special portions of the text"

The illustrative examples are for *martyān*, *martyāñ avivega* (v 7 9¹) For *ud ayān*, *ud ayāñ aśasram* (iv 6 3²) with a counter-example, *vayobhū evā 'yān ava rundhe* (v 2 10⁷), to show that

21 ----¹ ---- *eteshu² grahaneshu nakāro 'natiparo 'yakāram*
āpadyate³ anitiparatvākarshako 'yam⁴ cakārah vishayān⁵ and-
ārtya sarvātho⁶ 'yam itah⁷ param āmbhah yathā mart-
---- ud ay-... ud iti kim vayo-... ud-... bhāḍ-...
na somapūrvah ḍuryān ity atra nakārah somapūrho yatvam⁸ nā
"padyate pra-... so-... so iti kim indro-... avr-
gom-... madh-... avigomadhv⁹ iti kim paṣu-... hav-
... hūtamān ārshe¹⁰ hūtamān ity atra nakāra¹¹ ārshe svare

the *ut* before *ayān* needed to be quoted along with it. For *amr-tān*, *ud asthām amrtān anu* (1 2 8¹). For *duyān*, *bhadrān duyān abhye'ha mām anuvratā nyu* (1 6 3¹ G M O omit *mām* etc.) there are two other cases, at 1 2 13¹ v 1 2 9¹, and a single exception, *pīa ca d soma duyān adityāh* (1 2 10¹), quoted by the commentator in justification of the restriction "not preceded by *soma*." For *asmān*, so *asmāñ adhipatīn karotu* (1 6 6⁴ and 11 2 7²) another example is at v 7 9¹, and *asmān* becomes *asmāñ* also at 1 6 12⁴, but in virtue of the preceding rule. The counter-example, showing the necessity of prefixing *so* in the rule, is *indro asmān asmin dvitīye* (11 1 9² W B omit the last word). For *avimān*, *avimāñ ucvi* (1 6 6⁴, 7 6⁷ 11 1 11¹ but the last case falls under the preceding rule also). For *gomān*, *gomāñ agne* (1 6 6⁴, 7 6⁷ 11 1 11¹—that is to say, in the same phrase with *avimān*). For *madhumān*, *madhumāñ indriyāvān* (11 1 10²). Next follows a counter-example, intended to show why *mām* would not have been enough of itself to include the last three words, without the prefixed parts *avi*, *go*, and *madhu* it is *pacumān eva bhavati* (v 1 2 6² et al.) Then, for *haviṣmān*, *haviṣmāñ ā vivāsati* (1 3 12) the word occurs a second time in the same section, and also at v 1 4 2⁴. For *hātāmān*, *devahātāmāñ ity ukhāyām juhoti* (v 5 3¹ W B omit the last word) it is found again, in like form, in the succeeding division of the section. The specification "before any vowel belonging to the text (*ārśhe*, 'coming from the *rśhis*')," is declared to be meant as an annulment of the restriction, "except before *iti*," made in the preceding rule. And, to show that the *n* remains unchanged before a vowel not forming part of the fundamental text, is given the *pada*-reading *devahātāmān iti deva-hātāmān*. There is added further a remark which looks like a gloss that has worked its way into the text "the specification 'before what comes from the *rśhis*' has force in both directions, after the fashion of the crow's eye [Molesworth says, the crow is regarded as having a single eye, which shifts from one eye-

*pare*¹¹ *yatvam āpadyate*¹² *dev----* *ārśha iti kim dev--* *13 ānshagrahanasāmarthyād itiparatve*¹⁴ *pi*¹⁵ *yatvam bhavati ār-*
*śha iti kākāhskvad*¹⁶ *ubhayatra sambadhyate grahokhyādma-*
*hānparyantam*¹⁷ *ārśhasvayampātha*¹⁸ *ity arthah cikrit----*
*idāv----- kuk----- viṣ----- idākakshābāne*¹⁹ *'ti kim ras-*
----- sam----- hī'ti kim ārj----- ārśha itiparatvād dev----
*itvad yatvaprāptir hīgrahanena nishidyate*²⁰ *stuto----* *su-*
vid----- amit----- arāñ----- posh----- agne----

¹ For *asomapurvāh*, G M read *ity esha nakas as somapūrvō 'nusvaran na* "pad-yate, B O *nā som*, as do T G M in the rule itself. ² G M O *eshu* ⁽³⁾ G M *yatvam bhagye* ⁴ G M om *ayam* ⁵ G M *vāhan*. ⁶ W *sarvo 'rīho* ⁷ W B *iti* ⁸ G M *devān* ⁹ W O *avimāñ* ¹⁰ W adds *cikritvān* ⁽¹¹⁾ G M O *ārśhasvayamparo* ¹² W *nāpadyate*, B *bhavati*, G M O *bhagye* ¹³ G M ins *ity* ¹⁴ G V *pare* ¹⁵ G M ins *hātāmān ity ukhāyām ity atra* ¹⁶ W O *kākāsh*, G M *-kshamāyena* ¹⁷ W B om *mām* ¹⁸ B *ārśha* sv-, G M *ārśhabhāvan* ¹⁹ G M *idāvīpeshena* ²⁰ G M O *p'atish-*

ball to the other, as it is needed]—namely, from the beginning of the preceding rule to the end of the present one” This appears to mean that an *iti* belonging to the sacred text itself would admit the conversion of the *n* before it, in any case falling under these two rules. The opinion is doubtless a sound one, but, to prove its expression pertinent here, we require an example showing that there is a passage in the text requiring its application and none such is furnished us on the contrary, the addition of *ārshe* to *hātamān* alone implies that none is to be found. The example for *cikṭvān* is *cikṭvān anu manyatām* (iii 14¹ O omits the last word) For *idāvān*, *idāvān eshaḥ* (i 6 6⁴, also at iii 111¹, but this is a case falling under the preceding rule) For *lakṣhīvān*, *lakṣhīvān āucyāḥ* (v 6 5³) For *bānavān*, *viśalyo bānavān uta* (iv 5 1⁴ O omits the first word) Next we have again a counter-example, *rasavān eva bhavati* (ii 2 4⁵), showing that, of words ending in *vān*, only those preceded as here specified undergo the prescribed effect. For *hi payasvān*, *sam asrkṣmaha payasvān agna ā gaman* (i 4 45³, 46² only O has *sam*, and G M O omit the last two words) the necessity of the prefixed *hi* is shown by the counter-example *ūryasvān payasvān ity āha* (i 7 3⁴) Here, however, is a case of *payasvān* before an *iti* which comes from the *rshis*, and therefore might seem to require the reading *payasvān*, like *hātamān* in the passage *devahātāmān ity ukhāyām* (v 5 3¹)—according to the extension made above of the natural and obvious meaning of *ārshe*, but the commentator declares that the mention in the rule of *hi* as necessary preceding word prevents the conversion of *n* to *y* in the passage it is, to be sure, a case of *payasvān* before *iti*, but not of *hi payasvān*. For *vacān*, the example is *stuto yāsi vacān anu* (i 8 5¹) For *vidatrān*, W O give *suvidatrān api 'ta* (i 8 5²), while G M have instead *suvidatrān avitsi* (ii 6 12³) B is defective here, dropping out the last part of this quotation, and the first part of the next (reading *suvidatrān apabādhamānah*), G M are in the wrong this time, for the passage they quote falls under the preceding rule. For *amitrān*, *amitrān apabādhamānah* (iv 6 4²) an exception is provided for in the final rule of the chapter. For *arān*, *arān vā 'gne nemah* (ii 5 9³ O omits the last word) For *poshān*, *poshān apushyat* (vii 1 9) For *mahān*, *agne mahān asi* (ii 5 9¹) another case at i 4 20

इन्द्रोमेष्कवृद्धमिहाप्येवगन्मेडेन्यानायतिष्ठयाचर्वकुर्व-
ताडुहृदितिरयेधरात्सपत्नानलंपरश्च ॥ २२ ॥

22 Also a *n* followed by *indro me*, *akah*, *ūdhvam*, *ihā*, *apy etu*, *aganma*, *īdenyān*, *āyayishthah*, *ā ca*, *rtu*, *akurvata*, *aduhat*, *aditih*, *agre*, *adha*, *ant sapatnān*, and *alam*

22 ----- *ity evamparo nakāra 'ākārapārvo yatvam' āpadyate cakāra' ākārapārvatvākārshakah yathā sap----- ma iti kim. yush----- nigr----- yūy----- agne----- dīrghena kim.*

The implication here, the commentator tells us, is of a *n* preceded by *ā* only—he does not explain why, but would have a right to appeal to the mention of *ān* last in rule 20, and the exclusion of any other cases than those of a final *ān* in rule 21. His examples are as follows. For *indro me, sapatnāñ indro me* (1 1 13¹, 6 4² 1v 6 3⁴), with a counter-example, *yushmān indro 'vrūta* (1 1 5¹), to illustrate the need of specifying *me*. For *akah, nigrābhend 'dharāñ akah* (1 1 13¹, 6 4² 1v 6 3⁴) that is to say, in the same passage as the preceding (O omits the first word). For *ādhvam, yāyam devāñ ādhvān* (1 3 8² O omits the first word). For *ihā, agne devāñ ihā "vaha* (1 3 14³, 5 5³ 1v 6 1³), with a counter-example, *yajñyān iha yān havāmahe* (1 5 10³ only W has the last word), to show that the *numitta* in this case is *ihā*, not *iha*. For *apy etu, gharmno devāñ apy etu* (1 5 10⁴ B omits *gharmah* again at 1 6 3²), with the counter-example, *vidvān api janyeshu* (v 1 1 6⁶), to show that *api* without *etu* does not cause the conversion. For *aganma, surar devāñ aganma* (1 7 9²). For *idenyān, idānahā devāñ idenyān* (1 5 9⁶). For *āyāśsthaḥ, devāñ āyāśsthaḥ svastī* (1v 3 13¹, 6 1⁵ O omits the last word). For *ā ca, devāñ ā ca vakṣat* (1v 6 3⁴ twice, and v 4 6⁶ twice), but this example is omitted by G M, and they also omit the item *ā ca* in the rule itself. A counter-example, *yān ā vaha ucatih* (1 4 44² G M omit the last word), is given by all but O. In G M, it should show that *ā* causes *āñ* only when followed by *yajñsthaḥ*, in W, only by *yajñsthaḥ* and *ca*, but W states the occasion for it in the same manner as G M, and B alone sets it in its proper relation to both the foregoing examples. For *rtu*, the example is, in W B, *vājo devāñ rtubhūh* (1v 7 12²), but G M O give instead *yebhur devāñ rtubhūh* (1 1 14⁴). I have found no other case. For *akurvata, vttvā kāmāñ akurvata* (1 5 9³). For *aduhat, yajño 'surāñ aduhat* (1 7 1¹). For *aditih, vivasvāñ aditih* (1 5 3³). For *agne, agnis tāñ agne* (1 1 4²) we have also *vāyus tāñ agne* in the same division. For *adharān, anyāñ adharānt sapatnān* (1 2 8⁵), with a counter-example, *bhrātrvyān adharān pādāyāni* (1 1 5 3¹). For *alam, purodācāñ ulam kurv iti* (v 1 3 1²). Finally, to show that the rule applies only to *ān*, *paridhīn akurvata* (v 1 2 1⁵ 6).

The comment closes with an exposition which I must confess that I do not fully understand. It is evidently intended to determine the readings which the words treated in these rules shall have in *jutā*-text, and it furnishes abundant illustrations, in reference to the form of which, however, there is not a little difference between the different recensions. G M O generally citing the passage first

yajñ-.... ghar-.... etv iti kim vidvān-.... suvai-....
 idā-.... devāñ-.... 'dev āñ-.... 'yajñsthaḥ ce 'ti kim yān
 'vājo-.... vit-.... yajño-.... vivas-.... agnis-....
 anyāñ-.... sapatnān iti kim bhrā-.... puro-.... anvāde-
 śah kumārthah par-.... tattatpadagrahane kartavye parapa-
 dagrahanam 'andśhe 'pi⁵ samhitāvidhāv⁶ agrahanasya⁷ ca⁸ ya-

in its *saṃhitā* form, and adding only a single *sandhu* from the *ṣatā*-text, while W B give the complete *ṣatā*-readings, and only those. The former quote first *amartyo martyāñ āvvega* (v 7 9¹), and add *martyāñ amartyah*, W gives *amartyo martyāñ martyāñ amartyo 'martyo martyāñ*, and *martyāñ āvvega* "vvega martyāñ martyāñ āvvega", B only the latter (and, blunderingly, treats it as *amartyāñ āvvega*, throughout), next, G M O have *ud asthām amrtāñ anu amrtāñ asthām* (12 8¹) W B, *amrtāñ anv anv amrtāñ amrtāñ anu*. Then, in illustration of a second point, we receive two more examples G M O read *agne 'vimāñ aṣvī avimāñ agne* (16 6⁴ et al), for which W B substitute *agne 'vimāñ avimāñ agne 'gne 'vimāñ*, and G M O, again, *ud ayāñ aṣasram* (1v 6 3³), O this time adding the full *ṣatā*-reading *ud ayāñ ayāñ ud ud ayāñ*, which G M also seem to mean to give (they actually have only *ayāñ ud ayāñ*), while W B set down the *ṣatā*-form of the other pair of words *ayāñ aṣasram aṣasram ayāñ ayāñ aṣasram*. Yet once more, two examples for a third point close the tale in G M O *agnis tāñ agne tāñ agniḥ* (11 14²), in W B *tāñ agre 'gre tāñs tāñ agre*, and, this time in all alike, *anyāñ adharāñ adharāñ anyāñ anyāñ adharāñ* (but G M have, doubtless by a copyist's blunder, *anyāñ* the second time, before *anyāñ*). It will be seen that the two versions are in part inconsistent with one another as regards the special points of combination to which they direct attention, and I am not able to make out what are the three classes of cases meant to be distinguished. The three points which one would most naturally think of as needing to be noticed are, perhaps, first, the occurrence of a word like *amrtāñ* before itself—thus, *amrtāñ amrtāñ*—in the *ṣatā* repetition, second, its occurrence before a preceding word (not its defined or natural *nimitta*) when that word begins with a vowel—thus, *amrtāñ asthām*, and third, its occurrence in *ṣatā* before the word which causes its alteration in *saṃhitā*—thus, *amrtāñ anu*—if, indeed, this last can be regarded as requiring any special prescription. Or, the second and third cases might be expected to concern the treatment respectively of a word, on the one hand, like *martyāñ*, which is itself quoted in the rule as suffering the prescribed change (which is at the same time *grahana* and *nāmattika*, or *nāmattikam grahanam*), and might therefore naturally be inferred to be liable to the change under all circumstances before a vowel, and one, on the other hand, like *anyāñ*, which is pointed

tvam syād iti nāmattikasya ca nimittāpekshatvāt grahanasya yathā amartyo---- ud---- evam nāmattikagrahanasya agne---- ud---- evam grahananāmattikasya⁹ agnis---- anyāñ---- evam sarvatra nakārasya yakārotpattir¹⁰ drashtavyā

(¹) B om (²) G M O *yakaram* (³) G M om (⁴) O om, W G M read *yajshtha iti kim* etc (⁵) G M a (⁶) O *-āhane*, B *āhanasye* (⁷) B om (⁸) G M O om (⁹) G M O *nasya na-* (¹⁰) G M *nakā-*

out by means of the quotation of the following word *adharān* (which is itself, therefore, *nāmīttika*, while *adharān* is *grahana*, or which is *grahananāmīttika*, 'undergoing a prescribed effect under the influence of a quoted word'), and which one might suppose changeable only before that word. It is in accordance with this latter explanation that the last two pairs of examples are taken, the one from under rule 21, the other from under rule 22. At any rate, the general conclusion appears to be pretty well assured, that a word which shows a final *ñ* in *saṃhitā* shows it also in *ṛatā* before a following vowel of whatever kind. This is markedly different from its treatment in *pada*, where, by the initial specification of rule 20, its power of conversion to *ñ* is lost altogether and even in *ṛatā* (as was shown in the note to iii 1), an altered letter usually exhibits its *saṃhitā* form only under the specific circumstances which condition that form in *saṃhitā*-text.

न रश्मीज्जपयान्यमान्यतद्गात्समानानर्चान्यजीयान् ॥२३॥

23 The *n* of *racmīn*, *crapayān*, *yamān*, *patañgān*, *samānān*, *arcān*, *yajīyān* remains unchanged.

All these are words occurring in the passages respecting which the comprehensive prescription of rule 20 was made needing, therefore, to be specifically exempted from its action. The commentator quotes the phrases in which they occur, as follows *pu-
-utrá ca racmīn anu* (iv 1 2³), *adītiḥ crapayān iti* (iv 1 5⁴), *suyamān ātaye* (iv 7 15^{4,5}), *patañgān asamdītaḥ* (1 2 14¹), *samānān uḡann agne* (iv 3 13³ only G M have the first word), *arcān indra grāvānāḥ* (1 6 12⁶ G M have dropped out all but *arcā*), and *yajīyān upasthe mātuh* (1 3 14¹ O omits the last word). The first two are from *ukhya* passages, the third from a *prsthya*, the rest from *yājyā*—as is noted also by the commentator (but G M omit these notices, save the first). Under the second, he further suggests the objection that, as the word following *crapayān* is *iti*, the case might seem not to fall under the rule (since this expressly says "except before *iti*"), but he urges in reply that the word *ārśhe* in rule 21 (that is to say, of course, according to his

23 ¹----- *eteshu*¹ *grahaneshu* *nakārah* *sva* *aparo* 'pi *na kha-*
*lu repham yakāram*² *vā bhajate yathā*³ *pu* *u*----- *ad*-----
*ukhyatvād anayoh prāptiḥ*⁴ *nanv ad*----- *asye*⁵ 'tiparatvād
*eva nishedhe satri grahanam anartham*⁶ *iti cet ārśha itiparatvāt*
punah prāptiḥ tan mā bhūd *iti brūmah* *suy*----- 'prsthityatvāt
*prāptiḥ*⁸ *patañ*----- 'yājyātāt¹⁰ *prāptiḥ*⁹ *sama*----- *ar-*
cān----- *yaj*----- ¹¹*eshām api sdr* 'va *prāptiḥ*¹¹

(¹) G M *racmīn ity ādīshu*, O *eshu* for *eteshu* (²) G M *vā yatvam* (³) B *tathā*, the rest om (⁴) G M *ptmashedhah* (⁵) G M *atra* (⁶) G M O *itakam* (⁷) O om *iti* (⁸) G M om (⁹) G M om (¹⁰) O ins *asya* (¹¹) G M om

“crow’s eye” interpretation) gives the former precept authority over it, which requires to be annulled

उद्यापरश्चोद्यापरश्च ॥ २४ ॥

24 Nor a *n* followed by *ut* or *athā*

The phrases to which this rule relates are, as quoted by the commentator, *amitrān un nayāma* (iv 1 10³), and *vidvān athā bhava* (iii 2 11^{2 3}), our *samhitā*-text has *atha*, because the word stands *viḥhāge*, at the end of a division of the section see rule iii 10 and note) I have noted no other cases. The commentator gives a counter-example to the former, showing why *ut* could not have been extended to *uta*, but needed to stop at the consonant (*hal*) it is *ti iñr uta dyān* (ii 1 11⁵). Such a counter-example is quite out of the usual course, and very superfluous, the example itself would be counter-example enough the substitution of *uta* for *ut* would have excluded the very passage aimed at. Of the two phrases, the one comes from an *ukhya*-passage, the other from a *yāgyā* the commentator might better have spent his spare energy in telling us this.

What remains of the comment to this rule is not altogether free from difficulties. First the statement is made that the word *athā* in it implies also *atha*, with short *a*, in illustration, W repeats, without change, *vidvān athā bhava*, B gives the same twice over, only O has, in *krama*-text, *vidvān atha athā bhava*—which is doubtless correct, and shows the *krama*-reading (along, we may suppose, with the *jatā*) to be the matter aimed at. That the now accepted *samhitā*-reading—*vidvān atha २ bhava*—is contemplated, is not at all to be assumed. Both the statement and its illustration are wanting in G M and this, although those manuscripts contain, under viii 34, the reference to it in advance there made. In regard to what follows, also, the recensions are considerably at variance. The *jatā*-text is again under

24 *ut athā¹ ity evamparo nakāro yathāvihitam² repḥam yakāram vā³ nā⁴ padāyate⁵ yathā⁶ amit-.... halmātrēna⁷ kim ti iñr-... vidv-....⁸ dīrgho tra hasvopalakṣhaṇam apī yathā vidv-....⁹ yathāsamhitāsthān¹⁰ eva nimittam¹¹ svakāryam karoti¹² nishedharāpam¹³ yathā amit-.... vidhir apy¹⁴ evam yathāsamhitāsthānimitta evam sarvatra bhavaty¹⁵ ato¹⁶ vocāma¹⁷ so-.... asm-.... evamādi vedītavyam.*

iti tribhāṣyaratne pratīcākhyavivarane
navamio dhyāyah

(¹) W B O *athā* (²) G M O put after *apadyate*, G M *repḥam va yavam vā*
³ G M ins *cakaro nishedhakarshah* (⁴) G M O om (⁵) G M O *ud it* (⁶) G M om, B om *yathā*, O om *apī yathā* (⁷) G M ins *ity atra*, O ins *atra*
⁸ G M O *-sthā* (⁹) G M *nimittam eva sambhavati*, O *nimittam eva sarvatra bhavati*
¹⁰ W B *-the* (¹¹) G M om (¹²) O ins *vidhirāpam vā* (¹³) W *iti* (¹⁴) O only *yathā* (¹⁵) W *atho* (¹⁶) G M ins *yathā*

treatment, and it appears to be laid down that any word has in that text the same form as under analogous circumstances in *samhitā*, whether it fall under an exception or under a rule. Then, as example of an exceptional word, is given, as established by the present precept, *amitrān ud ud amitrān amitrān ut* (iv 1 10²), *amitrān* retaining its *n* throughout, and again, as examples falling under the more general rule, *so asmāñ asmānt sa so asmān asmāñ avahāyā 'vuhāyā 'smāñ asmāñ avahāyā* (v 7 9¹ under rule 21)

So far, now, as I have been able to discover, the teachings of the Prātigakhyā in rules 20–24 of this chapter precisely correspond with the conditions of the known Taittirīya text. I have not found in the latter a single case of final *āñ*, *iñr*, *ūñr* which they do not duly notice, nor an exception to the more general rules which is not provided for. Of course, my observation is more to be trusted upon the former point than upon the latter.

The *sandhi* here treated of is comparatively unusual in our Saṁhitā, as it is in those of the other Vedas. According to my count, there are (including repetitions) 115 cases of *āñ* (including also one at iv 6 6⁷, omitted above), 5 of *iñr*, and 4 of *ūñr*—in all, 124, while, of final *ān* remaining unchanged before a vowel, I have noted down over 450 instances (and probably not without overlooking a score or two), of *ān*, about 150, of *in*, 16, and of *īn*, 4—in all, about 620, or not less than five times as many. The numerical relation in the Atharva-Veda is probably nearly the same. See the end of the note to Ath Pr II.27

CHAPTER X

CONTENTS 1–9, combination of final and initial similar vowels, and of final *a* or *ā* with initial vowels and diphthongs, 10–12, resulting accentuation and nasalization, 13, special cases of uncombinable final *ā*, 14, of elision of final *a*, *ā* before initial *e* and *o*, 15–17, combination of final *i* and *u* vowels, and resulting accentuation, 18, special cases of uncombinable final *i*, 19–23, elision of final *y* and *v*, 24–25, uncombinable final vowels

अथैकमुभे ॥ १ ॥

1. Now for the coalescence of two vowels into one.

An introductory heading to the whole chapter. The commentator paraphrases “both syllables become one form, of the same kind”

1 *athe 'ty ayam adhikārah ubhe akshare ekam rūpam sayā-
tīyam' āpadyete' ity etad adhikṛtam vedītavyam ita uttaram yad
vākshyāmah*

¹ O puts before *rūpam* ² MSS -*yata*

दीर्घः समानान्तरे सवर्णपरे ॥ २ ॥

2 In the case of a simple vowel, followed by a similar vowel, the product is long

For the terms *samānāṅkshara* and *savarna*, see rules 1 2, 3, where they are defined. The grammatical construction of the rule is not simple, or easily made homogeneous with that of its predecessor. The commentator brings it out thus: "there being a simple vowel, followed by one that is of like nature with itself, these two, being put in the relation of predecessor and successor, become a single long vowel." His examples are *tvacam grhṇishvā 'ntaritaṅ rak-shah* (1 1 8 only O has the first word, only G M the last), *rāśnā 'sī 'ndrānyā* (1 1 2²), and *sūpasthā devo vanaspatih* (1 2 2³ only G M have the last word)

अथावर्णपूर्वे ॥ ३ ॥

3 Now for cases in which an *a*-vowel stands first

A new sub-heading, having force as far as rule 2, inclusive. The word *avarnapūrve* is explained by the commentator after the manner of a *karmadhāraya* compound, as meaning 'that which is both an *a*-vowel and first,' but I do not see how such a construction can be defended: we have, rather, to understand *akshare*, and make the meaning analogous with that of rule 2 "when there is a syllable that has an *a*-vowel before it"

इवर्णपर एकारम् ॥ ४ ॥

4 When an *i*-vowel follows, the product is *e*.

The commentator explains *varnapare* in the same manner as *avarnapūrve* in rule 3. The interpretations might hold good, if *pūrva* and *para* were taken substantively, but they are not so used anywhere in the treatise. His chosen example is *ne 'shtir bhava-*

2 *samānāṅkshara ātmanah savarnapare satī pūrvāparibhāte*¹
² *ete ubhe* ³ *dirgham ekam* ⁴ *āpnutah* ⁵ *yathā* ⁶ *tvac----- rās-----*
⁷ *sūp----- savarnam param yasmāt tat* ⁸ *savarnaparam tasmān*

¹ G M *pūrvah parah te*. ² W O ins *satī*. ³ G M ins *akshare*. ⁴ W om,
 G M *adhikam*. ⁵ B *āpnoti*. ⁶ G M O om. ⁷ W om, O *tatrat*. ⁸ W B O om

3. ¹ *'athe 'ty ayam adhikārah* ² *'avarnapūrve* ³ *satī 'ty* ⁴ *etad adhi-
 krtam vedatavyam ita uttaram yad vakshyāmah* ⁵ *'adam adhikā-
 rāntaram* ⁶ *upāsargapūrva āram* (x.9) *ita paryantam. avarnaṣ
 cā 'sāu pūrvāṣ cā 'varnapūrvāḥ tasmān*

¹ O om. ² O. *vāte*. ³ W om *itī*. ⁴ G M *ayam adhikāra*. ⁵ O adds *avar-
 napūrve*

tu (11.5 5³ W reads *neshtu*), and O alone adds *mahendraya* (v 5 21, p *mahā-indrāya*)

उवर्णपर ओकारम् ॥ ५ ॥

5 When an *u*-vowel follows, the product is *o*

The commentator's single illustrative example is *ishe tvo* "rye *tvā* (11 1).

एकारैकारपर ऐकारम् ॥ ६ ॥

6 When *e* or *ai* follows, the product is *ai*.

The examples are *sam brahmanā prcyasvāi* 'katāya svāhā (1.1 8 O omits the last word), and *somāindrā babhrulalāmāh* (v 6 15, p *soma-āindrāh*)

The commentator again very elaborately explains *ekārāikārapare* as a *karmadhāraya* compound, formed upon *ekārāikāra* as a *dvandva*; and remarks that the same explanation applies also in the following rule

ओकारौकारपर औकारम् ॥ ७ ॥

7 When *o* or *au* follows, the product is *au*

The examples are *brahmāudanam pacati* (not found in the Tāt-

4 *avarṇapūrva varṇapare ca satī te¹ ubhe akshare ekāram āpnutaḥ ne 'sh-.... mah- varṇaḥ cā 'sāu 'paraḥ ce 'varṇa-parah² tasmin*

¹ G. M. ins *ubhe akshare* ² O om. ³ B *pūrvaḥ ca avarṇapūrvaḥ*

5 *avarṇapūrva varṇapare ca satī te¹ ubhe akshare² okāram āpnutaḥ ishe-....*

¹ G. M. O om. ² O om.

6. *avarṇapūrva ekārāikārapare ca satī te¹ ubhe akshare² pūr-vāparibhāte³ ākāram āpnutaḥ sam-.... som-.... ekāraḥ cā 'kāraḥ cā 'kārāikārāu tayoh samāhāra ekārāikāram. 'sam-āhāre dvandvaḥ⁴ tac ca tatparam cā 'kārāikāraparam karma-dhārayaḥ tasminn ekārāikārapare⁵ evam 'uparitanē 'pi sūtre⁶ samāsaḥ*

¹ G. M. om. ² O om. ³ G. M. *pūrvāpare*, and put before *akshare* ⁴ G. M. om. ⁵ O om. ⁶ O -*tanāsūtre* 'pi.

7 *avarṇapūrva okārāikārapare ca satī te¹ ubhe akshare² aukāram āpnutaḥ brah-.... dām-....³*

¹ G. M. O om. ² G. M. O om. ³ G. M. add *uktas samāsaḥ*

trīya Sanhitā, although it is read at Tāttirīya Brāhmaṇa 11 9³ we have *brahmāudanam pacet* at v 7 3⁴, and *brahmāudanam apacat* at vi 5 6¹. O omits *pacati*, leaving the citation such as might have come from either passage), and *dāmnā 'pāu 'māhan* (11 4 13)

अरमृकारपरे ॥ ८ ॥

8 When *r* follows, the product is *ar*

The examples are *ardharca ekām* (16 10⁵), and *āgneyya rcā* "gnādhram (11 1 6¹, p *āgneyyā rcā*)

I have not noticed a single example in the Tāttirīya Sanhitā of that retention of *r* unchanged after *a* and *ā*, only with correction of the latter, which is the rule in the Rik and Vājasaneyi Sanhitās, and which appears also in the Atharva-Veda, though against the authority of its Prāṭhākhya (see Ath Pr 11 46 note)

उपसर्गपूर्व आरम् ॥ ९ ॥

9 If a preposition precedes, the product is *ār*

The commentator points out that, as the implication "when an *a*-vowel stands first" is still in force from rule 3, this virtually means "if a preposition ending in *a* or *ā* precedes," *r*, of course, is inferred from the preceding rule. According to the list of prepositions given at 1 15, then, *ā*, *pra*, *ava*, and *upa* would be the only words authorized to form with initial *r* the *vrddhi* vowel instead of the *guna*, *parā* and *apa* being excluded. The commentator brings up but one example from the text, namely *upā rchatī* (15 9⁶. G M read *upā rchaty askandāya*, which I do not find anywhere we have *askandāya* after other words at 15 8⁵ 11 5 8⁶ vi 3 81³, the last time following *upā 'syati*, possibly this text was in the mind of the scribe who added *askandāya* in the comment on the present rule), he gives another from the *jatā*-text, *rtavyā upo 'pā rtavyā rtavyā upa* (v 3 1¹, 4 2¹), and, further, as counter example, showing that only a preposition ending in *a* or *ā* produces the prescribed effect, *vyrdham vā etat* (v 1 2¹ et al. O omits the last word). Additional cases of the same combination, with *ā* and *ava*, are quoted under rule 10 (at the end), if the text affords yet others, I have failed to note them. Nor have I observed any cases of the different treatment of *parā* and *apa* before *r*, so that here also I do not discover any reason for the strange restriction of the class of prepositions made at 1 15

8 *avarṇapūrva rkārapare ca satī te' ubhe akshare' aram ita vīkārām āpnutah ardh----- āgn-----*

¹ O om ² G M O om

9 *avarṇapūrva ity anuvartate' tasmād upasargapūrva ity avigeshavarṇāntoktā' avarnānto 'yam' upasargas tasyāi 'va grahanam rkārah sāmādhyāi lūbhyate upasargapūrva rkārapare*

उदात्तमुदात्तवति ॥ १० ॥

10 When an acute enters into the combination, the result is acute

That is to say, as the commentator points out, when the first constituent, or the second constituent, or both constituents, have the *udātta* accent, their combination is *udātta*. He gives a long list of examples in illustration of the working of the rule, promising that they shall exhibit the whole series of vowel-combinations just prescribed, from the second rule to the ninth, with all possible conditions of accentual combination. Thus, *saṁtā' prā' rpayatu* (111, p *prā' arp-* W reads *-yati*), *brāhma yachā' pā' gne* (117¹, p *yacha āpa*), *yāgyā'i* " *vā'i nam* (1135³, p *yāgyā' ā'* *evā enam* the *pada*-manuscripts have *ē'ti* for *ā'*, and so with the other prepositions), *pāshā' dhatta* (151², p *pāshā' ā adhatta* W B read *-tte*), *divi' va cākshuh* (136² and 1429⁴, p *divi' va* for this accent, which is opposed to the teachings of all the other Prātiśākhya, see under rule 17 of the present chapter), *adyā vāsu* *vasatī' tī' ndro hā devānām* (1153⁷, p *vasatī' itī indrah* O reads at the end *'ndram eva*, which I do not find anywhere in the *Sanhitā*), *mātrāvaruṇi' ty āha* (1167⁴, p *-nī' itī*). The question is then raised, whether the word *sūnnīyam* (1241¹) does not fall under this rule, since it exhibits a coalescence into one syllable of two vowels, whereof one is acute, but the reply is made, that a special rule in a later part of the chapter (117) prescribes for it the circumflex. The examples are continued *rēto dadhātā' t sakthyōh* (11419¹, p *dadhātu' ut*), *vānaspātayō nā' t tish-* *thanti tā'n* (1148³, p *ānu' ut* only G M have *tān*), and *tā' dīkshu' pā' dadhata* (1155⁴, p *dīkshu' āpa* G. M omit *tā*). So many are examples of the combination of two similar simple vowels into a long vowel the rest illustrate the cases of coalescence in which *a* or *ā* precedes. They are *sē mām no havyādā-*

ca satī te' ubhe akshare' āram itī vikāram āpnūtah upā----
rt----- avarnāntopasargaviśeshanena' kim vyr----- upasar-
gaṣ cā sū pūrvāṣ co'pasargapūrvah tasminn' upasargopūrvē⁸

¹ G M O om *anu* ² W *viśeshavar-*, B *viśeshoktā yatha*, G M *aviśeshoktā* *'pe*, O *aviśeshaktav aṣ* ³ O om *ayam* ⁴ G M om ⁵ B G M O om ⁶ G M O *upas*, G M B *-shena* ⁷ B om ⁸ G M om

10 *udāttadharmaviśiṣhte varne pūrvatah parata ubhayato vā*
sthite satī te ubhe apy ekādeṣam āpanne' udāttadharṇmakam² āp-
nūtah udātto 'syā' stī' ty udāttavān tasminn udāttavati sa-
mānāksharam ārabhyo sarvasmād' ekibhāve 'yathākramam udāt-
tānūdāttasvaratpārva ubhayor udātte vā' dāharanāni dargay-
shyāmāh⁵ sav----- brah----- yāy----- pāsh----- div-
----- adya----- mārit----- nanu sūnnīyam ity atro 'dātte-
nāi' kādeṣe satī kim na syād ayam vidhīh udāttapūrvādīkūre

tum (iv 6 6⁶, p *sāh imā'm* compare rule v 17), *tām ghē 'd agnir vrdhā'* (ii 6 11³, p *gha it* only G M have the last word), *savanamukhēsavanamukhe kāryē 'ti* (vii 5 5¹, p *kāryā it* B omits the first *savanamukhe*), *sē 'd u hōtā* (ii 1 14⁴, p *sāh it* compare rule v 17 W B omit the last word) so many are examples under rule 4. Now follow those under rule 5 *prōkshatam gopāyata* (vii 1 12, p *prā-ukshatam* G M omit this example), *ā'ija sthō 'rjam vo bhakshīya* (i 5 6¹, p *stha ā'rjam* O omits the last word), *svāyūshō 'd ōshadhīnam* (i 2 8¹, p *su-āyūshā it* G M omit this example also), and *imē evō 'pa dhatte* (v 2 7³, 5 3³, p *evā ūpā*). The examples under rule 6 are *nā'ri 'nam pratyōshati* (i 5 9⁷, p *nā enam*), *ēka evā yuyetā'ri 'kah* (vii 2 10³, p *yuyeta ēkah*), *āthā'ri 'kani utthā'nam* (vii 2 1⁴, p *ātha ēkam*), *yān nā'ri 'kāñ raçand'm* (vi 6 4³, p *nā ēkām*), *indriyām evā'ri 'ndrēna* (vi 6 5², p *evā āndrēna*), *vī hī tād avā'riyatē 'ti* (vii 1 5⁴, p *ava-ā'riyata*), and finally, from the *jatā*-text, *devēbhya ā'indhā'ri 'ndha devēbhyo devēbhya ā'indha* (ii 5 9¹ but G M give only the *samhitā*-reading, *devēbhya ā'indha*). To illustrate rule 7, we have *kshatrāsya cā'u 'jase juhomi* (iii 3 1^{1 2}, p *ca ājase* B O omit the last word), *svā'hā'u 'shadhībhyah* (i 8 13³, p *svā'hā ōsh-*), *sā'u 'shadhīr ānu rudhyase* (iv 2 3³, 11³, p *sāh ōshadhīh* another case under rule v 17 G M omit the last word), *prā'u 'kshih hēnā 'pā it* (ii 6 5¹, p *prā āukshih* G M omit the last word), and *arunō ha smā 'hāu 'paveçih* (vi 1 9², p *āha ā'upa-veçih*). Under rule 8, again, fall *āgneyyā'rcā' 'gnādhi am* (iii 1 6¹, p *āgneyyā' rcd'*), *sā'ri 'vā' 'syā rddhīh* (vi 6 10², p *asya r'd-dhīh*), *ā'indhā rshishtutah* (ii 5 9¹, p *ā'indha r'shi-stutah*), and *evā rshir asvadayat* (v 1 10¹, p *evā r'shah*). Under rule 9, finally, we have *ā'rtim ā' 'rchati* (i 5 2⁵ et al, p *ā' rchati*), and *avā'rchaty evām āvāram* (ii 6 3⁴, p *ava-r'chati*).

अनुनासिके ऽनुनासिकम् ॥११॥

11 When a nasal, the result is nasal

The commentator quotes rule xv 6, which declares it to be the

saty 'ābhāve ca (x 17) *iti sūtrena svaritasya viçeshavādhānād' iti brāmah ieto.... van.... tā.... evam samānākshana-samhitāyām ekibhāvo⁸ 'nyatrā⁹ 'pi drashtavyah¹⁰ evam avarna-pūrvatve¹¹ 'pi vakshyate¹² se.... tam.... sav.... se 'd.... pro.... ārya.... svā.... ime.... nāri.... ēka.... athāri.... yān.... indr.... vi.... deve.... ksha.... svā.... sāu.... prāu.... aru.... āgn.... sāri.... ā'indha.... eva.... ārt.... avā.... evamādī¹³*

¹ W *prāp* ² B G M *-rnam* ³ O *smann*, G M *upasargāntam* ⁽⁴⁾ G M. *udātānūdatasvaritānām pūrvatve ca paratve ca udātāyay udātāitave ca yathākrāmam* ⁵ O *prād-* ⁽⁶⁾ G M *ubhāv eva sat* ⁷ G M *vādhā* ⁸ W B *-ve* ⁹ G M *'trā* ¹⁰ W *-vyāh* ¹¹ G M *vorn-* ¹² G M *-ti* ¹³ G M *dayah*

opinion of some authorities that final simple vowels, not *pragāhas*, are nasal, and he states that the present precept has reference to them if such a nasal vowel, being acute, enters into a combination of the kind above described, the resulting single syllable is nasal. Examples, he says, are those already given. And he adds that the rule is not approved.

I cannot at all believe this to be the true interpretation. The rule seems, on the other hand, to belong to and represent the same view of the nature of a syllable ordinarily regarded as containing *anusvāra*, which appears so unequivocally at xv 1, and to mean that when such a syllable, being looked upon as one containing a nasal vowel, instead of a vowel with succeeding *anusvāra*, enters into combination with another vowel (of course, a preceding one), the result is also nasal. Thus, for example, *yah* with *aṅgum* would make *yo* 'ṅgum, *svāhā* and *aṅsābhyaṁ* (vii 3 16^{1 2}), *svāhā* 'ṅsābhyaṁ.

स्वरितानुदात्तसंनिपाते स्वरितम् ॥ १२ ॥

12 When circumflex and grave are combined, the result is circumflex.

The examples of this accentual result of combination, as given by the commentator, are as follows *kanyē* 'va *tunnā* (iii 1 11⁸, p *kanyā* *vā*), *chavīm* *chavyō* 'pā'kr̥tāya *svāhā* (v 7 20, p *chavyā* *upa-d'kr̥tāya* G M O omit *svāhā*), *yāgyār* 'shā' *vār* *sap-tāpādā* *śākvarī* (ii 6 2⁶, p *yāgyā* *eshā* G M O end with 'shā'), and *dītha* *kvā* 'syā' *havanīya* *itrī* (v 7 4², p *kvā* *asyāh* O omits the last two words). He then goes on to point out that the word *svarita*, 'circumflex,' being used in the rule without any distinctive sign, we are to understand the "constant" (*ṇitya*) or "independent" circumflex (see rule xx 2) to be intended. For this alone arises at the time of production of letters and syllables, elements of words, but the other kinds of circumflex arise after the time of origin of words, in connection with the euphonic combination of

11 *apragrahāḥ samānākṣharāṇy anundśikāṇy¹ eke-
śhām² (xv 6) ity ekeśhām³ matam tām uddiṣyā 'yam vidhāt tas-
mnn⁴ udāttavaty anundśike pūrvataḥ parata ubhayato vā sthite
saty⁵ ubhe⁶ akṣhare anundśikadharmam ekam āpnutah uktāny
evo 'dāharanāni*
'*etad anishtam*."

¹ O om ² B G M O om ³ G M O *yeshām*, B *eshām* ⁴ W *tasmād*
⁵ G M O *ms te* ⁶ B O *ms apy* ⁷ G M om, O *ne 'dam sūtram ishtam*

12 *svaritānudaṭṭayoh samnīpāta ekādāḥe saty ubhāv apī tām
svaritam āpadyete¹ yathā² kan----- chav----- yāj-----
atha----- iha svaritasyā³ 'vīṣeṣeṇa⁴ grahane nityasvarita eva⁵
grhyate tasya svaritasya⁶ vyañjanānām akṣharānām ca⁷ padā-*

syllables and words, by the requirement of such rules as xiv 29 and xii 9, and therefore primary quality belongs only to the "constant" circumflex whence, by the rule "when a general statement is made, that which is primary should be regarded as intended," it is proper that the constant circumflex should be here understood. In such cases, then, as *āthā 'bravīt* (iii 2 11³), where the long *ā* resulting from the combination of the final *a* of *ātha*, which has the enclitic circumflex (by xiv 29), with the initial *a* of *abravīt*, which is grave, has itself the enclitic circumflex, this is not in virtue of the present rule, but falls under the same general rule (xiv 29) that prescribes the enclitic circumflex.

To this effect the commentator and, whatever we may think of the argument by which he attempts to prove that *svarita* in the rule means only *ntya svarita*, we shall not question the soundness of his conclusions.

न धामापासिपरोबुधियाज्यापूषामिनन्तापि ॥ १३ ॥

13 Exceptions are *dhā*, *mā*, and *pā*, when followed by *asi*, also *budhniyā*, *jyā*, *ā pūshā*, and *aminanta*—before a vowel belonging to the text.

That is to say, these words constitute exceptions, not to the last rules respecting accentuation, but to those which prescribe the combination of a final *a* or *ā* with the following initial vowel. The commentator cites the passages in which the first three occur before *asi*, as follows: *svadhā asy urvī* (i 1 9³), *sahasrasya pramā asi* (iv 4 11³ O omits the first word), and *dhanvann va prapā asi* (ii 5 12⁴ O omits the first two words). I have also noted, for *dhā*, *varcodhā asi* (i 2 1¹), *dhā asi svadhā asi* (ii 6 4⁴), and *abhadhā asi* (vii 1 11¹), for *mā*, *pratimā asi*, *vumā asi*, and *unmā asi*, all in the same section and division (iv 4 11³) with *pramā*, as quoted and, for *pā*, *vratapā asi* (i 1 14⁴, 23¹ vi 1 4⁶) and *cahshushpā asi* (i 2 1²). To explain the added specification "when followed by *asi*," the *pada*-readings are quoted for us, namely *svadhe*

*vayavānām utpattikāla eva sambhavāt anyeshām tu⁸ padotpat-
tikdlād⁷ ūrdhvam aksharānām padānām ca¹⁰ samhitāyām udāt-
tāt paro 'nudāttah* (xiv 29) *iti vidhānāt tasmīnn anudāt-
te pūrva¹¹ 'udāttah svaritam¹¹ (xii 9) ity ādi¹² ca tasmān
ntyasya⁹ 'va mukhyatvam sāmānyoktāu ca¹³ satgām mukhye
sampratyaya ity tasyā⁹ 'va svikāro yuktāu athā.... ity ādāv
ekādeśasyo 'dāttānantarābhāvāt¹⁴ udāttāt paro 'nudāttah
svaritam* (xiv 29) *ity anenā¹⁴ 'va svaritatvam vyñeyam.*

¹ G M *ekam apnutaḥ* ² G M om ³ W O *-sya* ⁴ B *shana*, G M *sha-*
nam eva ⁵ O om ⁶ B *-ta*, G M *sa*, O *sarva* ⁷ W om ⁸ G M *ca* ⁹ G
M *paro*, O *aparo* ¹⁰ W om, G M O *vā* ⁽¹¹⁾ G M *udāttam* ¹² O om
¹³ W om ¹⁴ G M O *-nānt*

'*ti* *sva-dhā* (only W has *sva-dhā* in the repetition), *prame* '*ti* *pra-mā*, *prape* '*ti* *prā pā* (O omits the readings of *pramā* and *prapā*). Further, to explain the final specification *ārshe*, 'before a vowel belonging to the text,' W gives next the *jatā*-readings of *svadhā asī* and *prapā asī*, namely *svadhā asy asī svadhā svadhā asī*, and *prapā asy asī prapā prapā asī*, O has only the former, and substitutes for the latter *dhruvā* '*si* *धारुव* (1v 2 9¹, 3 7²), which would be in place as a counter-example showing that other words than those specified in the rule are not treated as it prescribes before *asī*, but is not introduced as such, and does not make its appearance at all in the other versions, B also has only the former (reading at the end *svadhā* '*si*), and adds *evam ādi*, 'and so on' G M give no *jatā*-readings at all here, but pass directly from the *padā*-readings to the quotations illustrating the remaining words of the rule, namely *pra budhnyā irate* (1v 3 13⁶ G M omit *pra*), *ghanvan jyā vyam* (1v 6 6^{1 2} only G M have the first word), *ā pūshā etv ā vasu* (11 4 5¹), with a counter-example, *tam pūshā* '*dhatta* (1.5 1²), to show that *pūshā* after any other word than *ā* is not uncombinable, and *ā te suparnā aminantā evāh* (11 1 11⁵ G M omit the first two words, O the first three). Now the question is asked again, "why is it said, 'when a vowel from the text follows'?" and W B O, having settled the point already so far as *dhā*, *mā*, and *pā* were concerned, reply by quoting the *jatā*-readings of the other four words, each with its successor, thus *budhnyā irat ī irate budhnyā budhnyā irate* (but B reads *budhnye* "rate, and O *budhnye* "rate, the last time), *jyā vyam vyam jyā jyā vyam* (B O again have *jye* 'yam at the end), *pūshā etv etu pūshā pūshā etu* (B O again *pūshā* 'tu in the third repetition), and *aminantū evūr evūr aminantā* '*minanti evāh* (B O once more *aminantā* 'vāh to close with) G M, however, who have the application of *ārshe* in the first part of the rule still to illustrate, give us here a most liberal series of extracts from the *jatā*-text first, for *asī svadhā* (11 9³ or 11.6 4⁴), namely *asī svadhā svadhā asy asī svadhā*, then for *svadhā asī*, as set down above (with *svadhā* '*si* at the end, like B, but it seems a merely accidental coincidence, for in all the other cases the third pair of words reads like the first, with the hiatus), for *iva prapā*, *iva prapā prape* '*ve* 'va *prāpā*, for *prapā asī*, as above reported from W, for *pra budhnyā*, for *budhnyā irate*, as in W, for *ghanvan jyā*, for *jyā vyam*, as in W, for *ā pūshā*, *ā pūshā pūshā* " " *pūshā*, for *pūshā etu*, as in W, for *suparnā aminantū*, *suparnā aminantā* '*minanta suparnā* *suparnā aminantū*, and for *aminantū evāh*, as in W. From all this illustration, we seem authorized to draw the inference that the words mentioned in the rule as having

13 *dhā mā pā* ¹ *eteshv* ² *antyasvara ārshe* ³ *pāthē* ⁴ '*siparah budhnyā jyā ā pūshā aminanta eteshv* ⁵ *antyasvara ārshe* ⁶ *svaraparāh pūrvavidhim na prāpnoti yathā* ⁷ *sva*---- *sah*----: *ghan*---- *asipara iti kim* *sva*----- ⁸ *pra*---- *pra*----

endings exceptionally uncombinable in *samhitā* nevertheless combine with *iti* in *padā* text, and also exhibit their uncombinable quality in *jaṭā* only before the words whose sequence calls out that quality in *samhitā*—*pāshā*, for example, uniting with its predecessor *ā* into *pāshā*, and *aminanta* with itself into *aminantā* 'minanta' (only, if we may trust the example given, *svadhā* being held apart from its predecessor *asī*, because this happens to be the same word with its successor and it is by no means impossible that the manuscripts are in the wrong upon this point) But this would be quite sufficiently intimated by the single restriction *ārshe*, without adding *asī* also, and that the latter is specifically intended to apply to the *padā*-readings, and the former to the *jaṭā*, is not easily to be believed. The *asī* would have best reason to be introduced because the words mentioned occur also before other vowels, with which they enter into combination—only, to be sure, I have not noted any cases in which they do so

एष्टरेतनेमन्नोन्नोष्ठेवःपरो लुप्यते ॥ १४ ॥

14 When followed by *eshtah*, *etana*, *eman*, *odman*, *oshtha*, or *evah*, an *a*-vowel is elided

That the elision mentioned in the rule is of an *a*-vowel is a consequence of the continued implication of the introductory rule x 3, above—although, as the commentator fails to point out, that implication was interrupted by rules 10–12, and was expressly stated at the outset to remain in force through rule 9. The passages contemplated are quoted by the commentator, as follows *aśīy' eshtā rāyah* (i 2 11¹), *gamatāra upetana* (iii 1 4², 5²), *apām tv'' emant sādāyāmi* (iv 3 1), *apām tv'' odmant sādāyāmi* (iv 3 1 G M O om *sādāyāmi* in both these citations), *svāh'' oshthābhyām* (vii 3 16¹), *upayāmam adharen' oshthēna* (v 7 12 O omits the first word), and *nir amimat' evaś chandah* (v 3 5⁴ O omits the last word). These are, so far as I have discovered, all the cases of application of the rule that the text contains. The commentator notes that rule 1 22, which allows a theme ending in *a*, quoted in a rule, to stand for its various derivative forms, is the warrant for regarding *oshthābhyām* and *oshthēna* as involved in *oshtha*. The

----⁸ *drsha iti kim*, *sva*----⁹ *pra*----¹⁰ *dhan*----*ā pu*----
¹¹ *ākārah kimarthah* ¹¹ *tam*----*ā te*----*ārshasvarapa-*
*ra*¹² *iti kim* ¹³ *budh*----*jyā*----*pū*----*am*----¹³

¹ O ms *ity* ² B G M *eshv* ³ B G M *sha* ⁴ B *pāthakale* ⁵ B G M O
eshv ⁶ G M *shapāthe* ⁷ B G M O om ⁽⁸⁾ O om ⁽⁹⁾ G M om ⁽¹⁰⁾ B
evam āh, O *dhrū* ----, G M om ⁽¹¹⁾ G M *ākārena kim* ¹² O om *para*
⁽¹³⁾ See the note, above

14 ----- *ity' evampas o 'varno' lupyate athā 'vārnapārve*
 (x 3) *ity' anuvartanād' avarna' iti labhyate aśī*----*gam*----
apām----*apām*----*svāh*----*oshthāśabdasya sarvāvastha-*

same two cases were given by him in illustration of the previous rule (see note to 122) As general counter-examples, to prove the implication of "an *a*-vowel," we have *ṣṭyoskthah ṣṭibhruh* (v 6 14), and *ṣṭyoskthāya svāhā* (vii 3 17)

इवणोकारौ यवकारौ ॥ १५ ॥

15 An *i*-vowel and *u* become respectively *y* and *v*

Here, the commentator tells us, the implication "preceded by an *a*-vowel" ceases, but the implication "followed by a vowel" has force—which implication comes all the way from rule 10 of the preceding chapter. The rule says *ukāra*, 'short *u*,' instead of *uvurna*, 'an *u*-vowel,' because long *ū* has already (by iv 5) been declared *pragraha*, and protracted *ū*s is made uncombinable below (by x 24). The examples are *abhy asthāt* (iv 2 8¹), *ūty aṣyāma* (1.3 14³), and *ā pūshā etv ā vasu* (1.4 5¹)

उदात्तोश्च परो ऽनुदात्तः स्वरितम् ॥ १६ ॥

16 And, when they are acute, a following grave becomes circumflex.

The word "and" (*ca*), we are told, brings down from the preceding rule the "*i*-vowel and *u*," there described as suffering a certain effect. The examples given of the production of this kind of circumflex accent, later (xx 1) described as the *kshāpra*, are *vy dvā' nena pān dhatte* (v 3 11³ only G M have the last two words), and *apsv āgne* (iv 2 11³). As counter-examples, we have first *nīcā' tām dhakshy atasām* (1.2 14²) and *mādhv ugnā'u juhōti* (1.3 2³), to show that unless the converted vowels are acute, no circumflex appears, and then, to prove that the following vowel must also be grave, *tād yād rey ādhy akshārāni* (1.4 11¹ G M omit the first word), *sā tv 'ā'yayeta* (1.6 6³ et al. G M omit this whole example), and *in nv 'ā' upastīrnam ichānti* (1.6 7³)

śya gṛahanam bhavati gṛahanasya ca (1.22) *iti vacanāt upay-*
---- *nir*---- *'avarṇo lupyata'* *iti kim ṣṭy*---- *ṣṭy*----

¹ G M -*napurvo* ² W -*tamanāḍ*, G M -*tamānāḥ* ³ G M *avānapurva*
(⁴) B -*napurvo* t-, O *naloṇa*, G M *napurva*

15. *avarṇapūrvādhikāro nvrtaḥ svaraparādhikāras tu var-*
tate atha svarapaṇo yakāram (ix 10) *iti pūrvādhyāye pra-*
*krāntaḥ varṇokārāu padāntāu*¹ *svaparāḥ yathāsamkhyena*²
yavakārāv āpadyete abhy---- *ūty*---- *ā pū*---- *dirgha-*
sya pragrahavidhānāt plutasya samdhinīśadhāḍ ukārasya kārōt-
*aratvatam*³ *krtam varṇokārāu yavakārāv iti*

¹ W puts after the next word. ² G M -*khyam* ³ G M *vakār-*

compare, for the peculiar *sandhi* in these last two examples, rule v 13

ऊमावे च ॥ १० ॥

17 Also when *ū* is the product of the combination

The "also" (*ca*) of this rule is interpreted as implying that, as in the case of the combination last considered, the first element going to form the *ū* must be acute, and the second grave. As examples of the combination and its accentual result are given *sūn-nyam va* (vi 2 4¹, p *sū-unnīyam*), *sūdgātā* (vii 1 8¹, p *sū-ud-gātā*), and *māsū 'ttīshthan* (vii 5 2², p *māśū ut-*), to which G M add *dikshā 'padādhātī* (v 5 5⁴, p *dikshā upa-dā*). The only other case of the kind which I have noted in the Sanhitā is *sūpasadanah* (vii.5 20, p *sū-upasadanah*). The commentator adds a couple of counter-examples the first, *sūpasthā' devāh* (i 2 2³, p *su-upasthā'h*), shows that the former *u* must be acute, the other, *tā' dikshā' 'pā 'dadhata* (v 5 5⁴), that the latter *u* must be grave.

A later rule (xx 5) gives this particular variety of the circumflex accent the name *praghshta*.

None of the other Vedic texts has an accentual usage corresponding with this. Indeed, there is not in the Atharvan a single case of a combination of two *ū*'s such as is here contemplated, nor has any from the other Vedas come to my notice, if such there be, they are left to follow the general analogy of combinations of acute and grave into one homogeneous vowel (as illustrated under rule 10, above), the acute element raising the other to its own pitch and making the result acute. On the other hand, an exception to this general analogy is made in the other Sanhitās (and duly explained in their Prāticākhyas see Rik Pr iii.7, Vāj Pr iv 132, Ath Pr iii 56), in favor of the coalescence of two short *i*'s into a long *i*, if the former be acute and the latter grave, they produce together a circumflex. Of such a combination, I have

16 *cakārah pūrvasūtroktanimittnā¹ vārnokārāv anvādiṣati udāttayor² vārnokārayoh paro 'nudāttaḥ ca³ svāritam āpadyate vy---- apsv---- udāttayor itī kim nīṣā---- madhv---- paro 'nudātta itī kim tāḍ---- sa---- in----*

¹ G M -*hno* 'pī ² G M om ³ O om

17 *cakārah pūrvodāttatvānvākarshakah¹ 'parasyā 'nudāttatvam anvādiṣati ca². pūrvēno 'dāttēna parasyā 'nudāttasyo 'bhāve kṛyamāne³ svaritam jñnīyāt yathā sūn---- sūḍ---- mā---- 'dik---- ' pūrvēno 'dāttēna kim sūp----- parasyā 'nudāttasye 'tī kim tāḍ-----*

¹ B O *pūrvasyo 'd-*, O -*tvānuk-*, G M *pūrvodāttam paratvānudāttam ca* "karshati" ² G M om, O, om *ca* ³ G M om ⁴ W B Q, om

noted about thirty cases in the Taittirīya text (examples, one in each book, are i 3 6² ii 1 3¹ iii 5 5² iv 1 6² v 1 7² vi 1 1⁶ vii 5 7⁴), the accentuation is throughout acute, as we should expect

न श्येती मिथुनी ॥ १८ ॥

18 Exceptions are *śyētī* and *mithunī*

That is to say, these words are exceptions to rule 15—and, being thus exempt from the conversion there prescribed, and there being no other rule requiring their alteration, they remain unchanged, as if they were *pragāhas*. Their examples are *śyāntena śyētī akuru-ta* (v 5 8¹ O omits the first word, *śyētī* occurs also in the next division of the same section, though not before a vowel), and *na mithunī abhavan* (v 3 6² B omits *na*). The latter word is found in two other places—at iii 4 9¹ and vi 5 8⁶—exhibiting the same uncombinable quality, and in the latter place it has been made (at iv 53) the subject of special exception as not a *pragāha*. The *pada*-text, in fact, writes both words as if no peculiar character belonged to them

लुप्येते त्वर्णपूर्वौ यवकारौ ॥ १९ ॥

19 But *y* and *v* are elided, when preceded by an *a*-vowel.

The word “but” (*tu*) in this rule, the commentator says, annuls the application of the rule to any other *y* and *v* than such as are the products of prescribed euphonic processes, and makes these alone the subjects of its action. As a *y* or *v* can never occur as final except by euphonic conversion, the particle has no very useful office to fill, according to the interpretation. Evidently enough, it is used here, as elsewhere in the treatise where a specific force is sought for it by the comment, simply as indicative of a sudden change of subject.

Vastly the largest class of cases falling under the rule is that in which, by ix 10, a *visarjanīya* has been converted into *y* after *a*, *ā*, *ās* before another vowel than *a*. In illustration of this class, the commentator quotes *āpa undantu* (i 2 1¹), *dhruvā asmin gopātāu* (i 1 1 G M O omit the last word), and *na vicityās itī* (vi 1 9¹). The next class consists of cases of final *e* and *ā*, converted into *ay* and *āy* by ix 11, 14 the examples are *ima evā'smān* (ii 4 10³), and *āśmahā eve'mān* (vii 5 2¹). Yet another class embraces the endings in *ān* of which the *n* was turned to *y* (with nasalization of the *ā*, or with *anusvāra* added, by xv 1–3) according to the rules at the end of the last chapter (ix 20–24) the selected example is *martyān duvega* (v 7 9¹). But the rule teaches also the

18 *śyētī mithunī ity etayor antyasvaro yathāvihitam¹ ya tvum nā* “*padhyate yathā² śyān- na----*

¹ O om ² W G M O om

elision of final *v*, and O boldly gives examples for this, as well namely, *vāyav ishtaye* (u 2 12⁸ W adds *durone*), and *ahāv ana-data* (v 6 12²), although the text, by a usage which the comment ratifies under the next rule but one (x 21), retains the *v* in such cases, and it is retained by O in these very phrases given to illustrate its omission W has only the former of the two, foolishly prefixing to it *avarṇapūrva iti kim*, 'why is it said, "when an *a*-vowel precedes?"' The other manuscripts pass the point without notice here, leaving it to be settled under rule 21 The true counter-examples for this precept, showing that the elision takes place only after an *a*-vowel, are given by all alike they are *abhy asthāt* (iv 2 8¹), and *hrtsvasah* (iv 2 11³)

नोव्यस्य ॥ २० ॥

20 Not so, according to Ukhya

Ukha denies that *y* and *v* are omitted in any case, and would therefore read *āpay undantu*, *imay eva*, *martyāñy ā*, and so on

वकारस्तु सांकृत्यस्य ॥ २१ ॥

21 Not *v*, according to Sāmkrtya

The connection of this rule is somewhat anomalous, but its meaning is sufficiently evident Sāmkrtya dissents from the principle laid down in rule 19, like Ukha, "but" (*tu*) his dissent does not go the whole length of the latter's, according to him, only *v* is "not" elided As the commentator has it, the fact that this rule teaches an exception is inferred, "by vicinage," from its predecessor its *tu* is intended as an annulment of the opinion of former teachers And he declares that it alone is approved, while the two that precede (the former of them, of course, only so far as it is inconsistent with this) and the two that follow (B O omit this) are rejected The examples are those already given by a part of the MSS under rule 19, namely *vāyav ishtaye durone* (u 2 12⁸)

19 *avarṇapūrvādu svarapārvādu yakāravakārādu¹ lupyete ya-thā āpa----- dhru----- na----- ima----- āśā-----² vāy-----³ ahāv-----⁴ mart----- evampūrvādu⁴ iti kim abhy----- hrt----- tuṣabḍa itarādu yavakārādu nartayann ādega-prāptayor evā¹ nāyor lopaviśhayatvam dyotayati avarṇah pārvā yābhyān tāv avarṇapūrvādu*

¹ G M *yavak-* ² W ins. *avarṇapūrvā it kim* ³ Only in O ⁴ G M *avar-nap-*

20 *ukhyasya¹ śākhināh pakṣhe² 'varṇapūrvādu³ yavakārādu na⁴ lupyete ukṭāny evo 'dāharanāni*

¹ G M ins *mate* ² G M *mate* ³ O *'pūrvādu* ⁴ B om G M have mixed together to some extent this and the following comment

W B omit this example, O puts it after the other one, and leaves off *durone*, and *ahāv anadatā hate* (v 6 1² O omits *hate*)

This is rather the most striking example afforded us of the overriding by the commentary of the obvious intent of the Pratiśākhya itself. The usage of the existing Taittirīya text is on the side of the comment we have a similar resolution of the final *a* of vocatives into *av*, with retention of the *v*, at 1 2 13² twice, 4 39, 6 12³ u 2 12^{4,5}, 4 12³, 6 11¹ m 2 10 vl. 4 3³. Of *āv* as result of final *āu* before a vowel, I have failed to collect the examples, but had there been any cases of the omission of the *v*, I think I should not have omitted to observe and note them.

उकारौकारपरौ लुप्येते माचाक्रियस्य ॥ २२ ॥

22 According to Mācākiya, both are omitted when followed by *u* or *o*

Instead of Mācākiya, the southern manuscripts have, both in the rule and in the commentary, Māyikāya

All the manuscripts of the commentary declare that "respectively" (*yathāsamkhyam*) is to be understood in the rule—that is to say, that it directs us to drop *y* before *u*, and *v* before *o*, but their examples do not support this interpretation, and it is palpably a false one. It is difficult to believe that the rule itself is not corrupted, and that it ought not to read *ukārāukārāparau lupyate*, 'v is dropped before *u* or *o*' (it does not occur in the text before *ū*), for, while we can discover no phonetic reason for the omission of *y* before a labial vowel, there is a very obvious difficulty in the utterance of *v* (*u*) before *u* (no real Sanskrit word begins with *vu*, nor can I recall it in the interior of a word except as the rare result of *sandhi*), and, as thus amended, Mācākiya's view would accord with the accepted doctrine of the Rik Prāt (u 9–11), and with one mentioned, though not adopted, by the Vāj Pr (iv 125).

The illustrative examples given are in part those which have appeared already, even more than once, under the preceding rules

21 *sāmnādhyān nishedho labhyate sāmkrtyasya mate 'varna-pūrvō vakāro na lupyate yakāras tu lupyata eve 'ty arthāh 'v āy-----¹ ahāv----- pūrvācādryanutanivartakas tuṣabduh sūtram idam eve 'shtam na tu pūrvadvayam² paradvayam³ ca*

⁽¹⁾ W B om, O puts after the other example ⁽²⁾ O *pūrvasūtrād* ⁽³⁾ B O om

22 *yakāravakārāv avarnapūrvāv ukārāukārāparāu lupyete yathāsamkhyam¹ mācākiyasyā² 'cāryasya mate³ āpa--- yā----- evampānāv uti kim tā----- vāy----- lupyete iti 'ha punarārambhān pūrvasūtradvayasthūtanāñah⁴ sambandhaṣaṅkā-nirākarandṛtāh⁵*

¹ O om, G M after *mate* ² G M *māyikasyā*, as in the rule itself ³ B G M *matena* ⁴ W *-tājanāna*, B *tajāna*, O *tanānābha* ⁵ O om *ṣaṅka*, W *-īham*

āpa undantu (12 1¹), and *yā oshadhayah* (1v 2 6^{4 5} so W B, but G M O give instead *yā jāta oshadhayah*, 1v 2 6¹), to which O adds an example for *v*, namely *gatakrata ut* (16 12³ it ought, in illustration of the rule, to read *gatakrata ut*), putting it between the other two. Counter-examples are *tu enam bhishajyanti* (11 3 11⁴ we are to understand, apparently, that Mācukya would read *tay enam*), and *vāyav ishtaye* (11 2 12³).

The commentator remarks in conclusion that the repetition of *hupyete* in the present rule (it was read above, in rule 19) is intended to remove all suspicion of the continued implication of the negative which forms a part of the two preceding rules.

लेशो वात्सप्रस्यैतयोः ॥ २३ ॥

23 According to Vātsapra, they are imperceptibly uttered.

It might admit of question whether the "they" here spoken of are final *y* and *v* in general, or only *y* and *v* followed by *u* and *o*, as specified in the last rule. As things stand, the use of the demonstrative *etayoh* rather favors, though not unequivocally, the latter interpretation, and it is the one adopted by the commentator. But if the preceding rule be restored to what we have suggested above as its more probable original form, then the *etayoh* will be very well in place here as referring to *y* and *v* in general, and this interpretation is supported by the fact that the Ath Pr (11 24) and Pāṇini (viii 3 18) ascribe a like opinion to another grammarian, Çakatāyana, whose peculiar views upon the subject are likewise hinted at by the Vaj Pr (1v 126). As the meaning of *lega* is defined to be *haptivad uccāranam*, 'utterance as if omitted,' there is not much for the two opposing parties to contend about.

न सुतप्रयहौ ॥ २४ ॥

24 Exceptions are protracted and *pragraha* vowels.

Such, namely, are exempt from the rules of combination—and not merely those given in this chapter, but also such as are found elsewhere—for example, at 1x 11, 12. There is nothing about the

23 ¹*vātsapiasya mata etayor*² *yahāravahārayor*³ *avarnapār-vayor legaḥ syāt* *lega nāma haptivad*⁴ *uccāranam etayor ity uktā dukāraparāu nirdeṣati uktāny evo 'dāharanāni*

⁽¹⁾ B om, along with the rule ⁽²⁾ Only in W ⁽³⁾ G M O *yavak-* ⁽⁴⁾ B *tam*

24 ¹*na khahu plutaḥ pragrahaḥ ca* ²*samdhivardham bhajete*³ *yathā astu . . . te . . . ityādivardhau nashiddhe 'nyasmanñ ca 'nārabhyamāne*⁴ *prakrtivad*⁵ *bhavati*

⁽¹⁾ G M *plutaḥ ca pragrahaḥ ca etāu na khahu* ⁽²⁾ W B O *-gate* ⁽³⁾ G M *'rabh*
⁽⁴⁾ O *-tyā*

rule pointing out that it has a bearing so extensive Only one example is given for each class *astu hīs ity abhātām* (vul. 1 6¹), and *te enam abhi* (11 5 6⁵)

The commentator points out, as he did not take the trouble to do under rule 18 of this chapter, that, the rules of combination being thus suspended with reference to these two classes, and no other rule being given about them, they remain in their natural condition

All the Pratiçikhyas have rules equivalent to this (Rik Pr 11 27, Vaj Pr 14 84, Ath Pr 11 33 in the note to Ath Pr 1 73 I overlooked the present precept of the Taittiriya-Pratiçikhya), none assumes that the pronouncing a vowel to be *pragruha* exempts it, *eo ipso*, from phonetic combination

परश्च परश्च ॥ २५ ॥

25 Also the remaining vowel

That is to say, the vowel remaining after the omission of the final *y* or *v* is, like those mentioned in the preceding rule, exempt from farther combination According to the commentator, the "also" (*ca*) of the rule brings forward "*y* and *v*," the fact of their constituting an exception is inferred from the neighborhood of the preceding rule, and *parah* means 'another,' and qualifies *samdhir* understood "no further combination takes place" This seems to me inadmissible, as there has been no suggestion of any such word as *samdhir* Perhaps *pau a* may be better understood of the vowel "following" the *y* and *v* of which the chapter has been treating It needs, at any rate, some violence to bring in the rule with the meaning which it is evidently intended to bear no one would have any right to guess, from its form and position alone, at what it is aimed

The commentator's examples are *āpa undantu* (1 2 1¹) and *agria man* (1 1 5¹) In reply to the objection that it would be enough to state the implication of the rule as "where an omission has taken place" instead of "an omission of *y* or *v*," he brings up *se 'd u hotā* (1 1 14⁴), *sāu 'nā 'nākena* (14 3 13² et al), and *sāu 'sha-dhīh* (14 2 3³), as examples of an elision of a final which does not prevent the further combination of its predecessor and its successor under the rules of this chapter

25 cakārākrshṭayor yavakārāyor lope satī parah 'samdhir na bhavati¹ yathā² āpa---- agria---- sāmndhyān nishedho labhyate namu lope satī 'ty³ etāvātā 'vā 'lam yavakārāyor iti kim se 'd---- 'sāu----⁴ sāu---- ity ādi

iti tribhāshyaratne prātigṛhīkhyavivaranē⁵
daçamo 'dhyañyah

⁽¹⁾ G M sandhvarāḥ na bhayate ⁽²⁾ G M om ⁽³⁾ W om itī ⁽⁴⁾ O om ⁽⁵⁾ O adds prathamapragne

CHAPTER XI

CONTENTS 1, initial *a* elided after *e* or *o*, 2-18, exceptions, cases of retention of initial *a* after *e* or *o*, 19, disident view as to the nature of the elision

लुप्यते वकार एकारैकारपूर्वः ॥ १ ॥

1 But *a* is elided when preceded by *e* or *o*

The subject of the omission or retention of initial *a* after final *e* or *o*, and of the accent thence arising, occupies the whole of this chapter and of the one next following, the cases of retention being mostly rehearsed in this. No attempt is made, here any more than in the treatment of other similar matters in the work, to effect a real classification—much less, an explanation—of the facts dealt with. Nor have I, on the other hand, drawn up such a classification, as I did for the Atharva-Veda (see Atharva-Prāṭiśākhya, under rule in 54). Doubtless, if drawn up, it would show nearly the same state of things to prevail in the Tāttirīya as in the Atharvan text—namely, that the elision is the greatly prevailing, almost exclusive, usage in the prose passages, while, in the metrical passages, the *a* is more usually retained where the metre requires its retention, and omitted where the metre requires its omission—although with numerous exceptions, of which the most regular is that the *a* is dropped in writing at the beginning of a *pāda*, where, of course, it was always retained in metrical utterance. The general subject of the relation of the written and spoken texts to one another in regard to this special point is well worth an elaborate investigation, founded on all the Vedic texts.

For the word “but” (*tu*) in the rule is given an alternative explanation. Some, the commentator says, regard it as suspending the force of the exceptional rule x 24 others, as marking the discontinuance of the general direction “followed by a vowel,” which has been in action since ix 10. As in other like cases heretofore, we have no good reason for applying it to any particular rule or phrase, it merely marks an abrupt transition to a new subject, somewhat exceptional in its relations to the principles already laid down. The subject was, however, anticipated and provided for in rule ix 13.

1 *ekārapūrva okārapūvo vā 'kāro¹ lupyate yathā² te....*
³so....⁴ *tuṣabdo na plutapragrahāv* (x 24) *iti nishedhasam-*
bandhavādhim⁵ nivartayati⁶ 'ti kecit svaraparādhakāram nivāra-
yati⁷ 'ty apare samgrante⁸ 'ekāraṣ cāu 'kāraṣ cāi 'kārukārāu⁹
ekārūkārāu pūrāv¹⁰ yasmāt¹¹ sa tathoktaḥ

¹ all the MSS *akaro* ² G M om ³ B om ⁴ G M -bandhī, O -bandham
⁵ G M *nivartayati* ⁶ in W only ⁷ B om ⁸ G M *yasya*

To illustrate the rule, only two phrases, both of frequent occurrence, are quoted namely *te 'briuvan* (ii.5 1³ et al) and *so 'briavīt* (ii.1 2¹ et al)

In the other Prātiśākhya, the apparent loss of initial *a* after *e* or *o* is treated as an absorption of it into its predecessor, or a unification of the two. See Ath Pr iii.53 and note, and rule 19 of this chapter, where a somewhat similar view seems suggested.

All the MSS excepting B read in the rule *ekāraokārapūrvah*, and, where the rule is quoted (i.61 and ix.13), we have six cases of this reading against three of *ekārāuk-*. But the former is simply an instance of the usage, so common in the commentary (see above, p. 4), of separating, for the sake of clearness, the elements of compound words, or otherwise disregarding the rules of *sandhi*.

अथालोपः ॥ २ ॥

2 Now follow cases of non elision

The rest of this chapter is occupied with an enumeration of the cases in which initial *a* is retained. First, in rule 3, a number of passages are specified in which non-elision is the rule, and elision (as determined by the rules of the next chapter) is exceptional, then, in the following rules, more isolated cases are disposed of.

धातारातिरुपवाजपेयनुष्टभ्येनायोव्यधुवन्नितिरियमेव-
सायाग्निर्मूर्धारुद्रप्रथमोपोत्तमविकर्षविकृव्यहिरण्यवर्णी-
ययाज्यामहापृथ्वे ॥ ३ ॥

3 The *a* is not elided in the following sections: those beginning with *dhātā rātiḥ* and *upa*, those styled *vājapeya*, those beginning with *jusha* and *cyenāya*, those styled *ukhya*, those beginning with *dhruvakṣutih*, *vyam eva sā yā*, and *agnir māṇḍiā*, the first and the next to the last of the *rudra* chapter, and those styled *vikarsha*, *vihavya*, *hiranyavarṇāya*, *yājyā*, and *mahāpr-shihya*.

Here are pointed out not less than seventy-three sections or *anuvākas*, in which *a* is not elided (except in the cases specified in the rules of the next chapter). Those designated by the annotation of their first words are i.4 44, 5 5 iii.1 10, 2 8 iv.3 4, 11, 4 4. The *vājapeya* sections are six, namely i.7 7-12. The *ukhya* sections (as pointed out above, under ix.20) are twenty, namely iv.1 1-10, 2 1-10. The *rudra* chapter is iv.5, containing eleven sections,

2 'athe 'ty ayam adhikārah 'alopa ucyata ity etad adhikrtam
vedatavyam ita uttaram yad vakshyāmah 'na lopo 'lopaḥ 'lopā-
bhāva ity arthah

¹) G. M. om. ²) all MSS na lopah alopah

those here referred to, then, are iv 5 1,10. The name *vikarsha* belongs to five sections, namely iv 6 1-5. Three sections, iv 7 12-14, are styled *vihavya*. The *hiranyavarnīya* section (as shown under ix 20) is v 6 1. The *yāgyās* have been repeatedly the subjects of prescription in earlier chapters (iii 9,11, ix 30), they are twenty-three sections, namely i 1 14, 2 14, 3 14, 4 46, 5 11, 6 12, 7 13, 8 22 ii 1 11, 2 12, 3 14, 4 14, 5 12, 6 11,12 iii 1 11, 2 11, 3 11, 4 11, 5 11 iv 1 11, 2 11, 3 13. The *mahāprsthya* sections, finally, are the first six of those which (as seen under ix 20) bear the name *prsthya*, they are iv 4 12, 6 6-9, 7 15.

Section 14 44 is quoted by its two first words, instead of by *dhātā* only, according to the commentator, because of the occurrence in another *gākhā* of a section beginning *dhātā devebhyo 'surān* (G M omit *asurān*). Again, iv 3 4 is quoted by *dhruva-kshatih*, instead of by *dhruva* (the first *padu* of *dhruva-kshatih*, 1 48), because *dhruva* (by 1 22) would include *dhruvah*, and there is another section beginning with this word, and containing cases of elision, *dhruvo 'si dhruvo 'hañ sayāteshu bhāyāsam* (ii 3 9)¹ only G M have the last two words, which would otherwise be violations of the rule. Yet again, to quote iv 3 11 by *vyam* simply would not answer, because 1 2 4 begins with *vyam te guka tanār*, and contains a case of elision, *sagarbhyo 'nu sakhā sayāthyah* (1 2 4)² only O has the last word, G M omit the example. But why quote by so long a phrase as *vyam eva sā yā*, of which the last two words are unnecessary? To this objection there is an alternative answer: some say that it is for the benefit of the dull-minded, others, that it is intended to include a verse which, though occurring in another place (at 14 33), is a remainder to this, and which contains the case of non-elision *o te yanti ye aparishu payān* (14 33 G M O omit *payān*). Now it is true that the single verse constituting 14 33 is of kindred subject with iv 3 11, and in the Rig-Veda forms part of the same hymn (1 113) with parts of the latter, and it is also true that the combination *ye aparishu* is not otherwise authorized by the Prātiçākhya, but it is, of course, little less than absurd to assert that an excessive

3 'dhātārātir ity' ādīshv anuvākeshv ekārapūrova okārapūrova
vā 'kāro na hīpyate 'dhātā rātir (14 44) ity atra yathā³
nidh----- rātir iti kim dhātā devebhyo 'surān iti gākhāntare
'upaprayanto adhvaram (15 5) ity atra yathā³ āre----
deva savitah pia suva (17 7) ity 'ādī shudamuvākānām'
vāpapeyasanyā⁴ 'atra yathā⁵ te no---- te agre---- jushto
vāca (iii 1 10) 'ity atra yathā⁶ yas- -- 'yo----⁷ syenāya
'patv'ane (iii 2 8) ity atra yathā⁸ namaḥ---- viçve----
ukhye yathā⁹ gruv---- namo---- dhruvakshatih (iv 3 4)
¹⁰ity atra yathā¹⁰ viçve---- ārmir----¹¹kshatih iti kim
dhruve 'ty¹² akārāntasya yudh¹³ graham syāt¹¹ dhruvo----
ity atra bhaved¹³ iti¹⁴ vyam eva sā yā (iv 3 11) ¹⁵ity atra¹⁵

quotation of the beginning of the one *anuvāka* has any right, or can have been intended, to include the other. The right of 1433, it may be remarked, to stand in the text to which our *Prātiçakhyā* applies, is assured by the contemplation of others of its phonetic phenomena by rules found elsewhere (most unequivocally by 115), its case of non-elision would seem to have been overlooked by the makers of the treatise, but discovered by the commentators, some of whom have tried to force it violently within the ken of their rules. It is necessary to quote 1444 by two words, because 163 also begins with *agnih*, and in it we find *yo me 'nti dūre 'ātīyati* (163¹ the example is wanting in G M). Finally, instead of *prsththya* passages, the *mahāprsththya* are specified, because of such cases as *prthvi te 'ntirikshena* (1212² the *anuvāka* is *prsththya*, but not *mahāprsththya*).

The commentator cites one or more examples from each of the sections or sets of sections which the rule specifies, as follows. From the section beginning *dhātā vāti* is taken *nūdhipatir no agnih* (1444¹), it contains three more cases, and one exception. From that beginning with *upa* comes *āre asme ca* (1551¹), it contains six other cases, and one exception. From the *vāyapeya* sections, *te no arvantāḥ* (1782²) and *te agre aśvam ā 'yūñjan* (1772²), they contain eleven examples, and eleven exceptions. The section beginning with *jushṭa* yields *yas te aṅguh* (11110¹), and O alone adds *yo drapso aṅguh* (11110¹), there are two other cases, and no exception. From the *gyenāya* section, *namah pitrbhyo abhi* (11283³) and *viçve arupā edhute* (11284⁴), there are four other cases, and two exceptions. From the *ukhya* sections, *grnavanti viçve amrtasya putrah* (14112⁵ only W has *putrah*) and *namo astu sarpebhyaḥ* (14283⁶), they yield seventy-five cases, and forty-five exceptions. From the section *dhruvakshatā* are cited the only two examples, *viçve abhi grnavantu* (14342⁷) and *āmīr di apso apām asi* (14343⁸ only G M have *asi*), there are no exceptions. From the section beginning *nyam* etc are taken *ketum krnvāne ayaḥ* (14311¹ G M omit *ketum*) and *trayo gharmāso anu* (14311¹), there are three other cases, and one exception. The

ketum---- *trayo*---- *nyam* ity ¹⁶*etāvātā* 'vā 'lam ¹⁸*nyam*
te çukra tanār (124) ity ¹⁷*atra sag*---- ity *atra mā bhād iti*
*sā ye 'ti padadvayam*¹⁷ *mandadhīyam pratipattiyartham iti kecit*
*anye tv anyathā kathayanti asyā 'nuvākasya çeshabhātā*¹⁸ *ya*
*rg*¹⁸ *anyatra sthātā sād 'pi* ¹⁹*svikurtavye* 'ti¹⁹ o *te*---- *agnir*
mārdhā ²⁰*diva* (1444) ity *atra yathā*²⁰ *sa*---- *enā*----
mārdhe 'ti *kum agnir mā durishtād* (163) ity *atra* ²¹*yo me*
 ---- ²¹*rudrapraçnasya prathamopottamānuvākayor yathā*²¹
namo---- *dīape*---- *uta*---- *uttamasya pūrvataḥ*²² *samni-*
krshṭa upottamah aśmann ūrjam (1461) ²⁴*ity atrā 'nuvāka-*
*pañcasya*²⁴ *vikarshasamyā tatrā*²⁵ *'nyam*---- *pārako*----
*vājo nah sapta pradiçā*²⁶ (14712) ity *atrā*²⁷ *'dyanuvākati-*

first example here is not well chosen, since the *e* of *kṛnvāne* is *pra-graha*, and *pragrahas* are not contemplated in the general rules for elision see xii 8 and note From the *agnir mūrdhā* section, *sa yojate arushah* (iv 4 4⁴) and *enā vo agnim namasā* (iv 4 4⁴ O omits *namasā*), there are three other cases, and one exception From the specified sections of the *rudra* chapter are taken *namo astu nīlagrīvāya* (iv 5 1³), *dī āpe andhasas pate* (iv 5 10¹), and *utā mā no arbhakam* (iv 5 10²), they afford fourteen cases, and five exceptions From the *vikarsha* sections, *anyam te asmit tapantu* (iv 6 1^{3,5} only W has *tapantu*) and *pāvako asmahyam* (iv 6 1¹ etc.), there are thirty-three cases, and ten exceptions From the *vihavya* sections, *viṣve adya marutah* (iv 7 12¹ O omits *marutah*) and *viṣve devāso adhī vocatā me* (iv 7 14² only O has *viṣve*), ten cases and five exceptions The *hiranyavarṇīya* section affords three cases only, of which one is cited, *eko devo apy atishthat* (v 6 1³) The *yājyā* sections afford a hundred and twenty-nine cases, with thirty-eight exceptions, the selected examples are *supathā rāye asmān* (i 1 14³, repeated at 1 4 3¹) and *kāmena kṛto abhy ānat* (i 1 14² W B O end with *abhy*) From the *mahāprsthīyas*, finally, come *vivasvad vāte abhi nah* (iv 4 12⁴) and *somo adhī bravītu* (iv 6 6⁴ O adds *no dim*, doubtless for *no ditiḥ*, which follows in the text), they contain thirty eight cases and nine exceptions

This rule, accordingly, disposes at one stroke of three hundred and fifty-one cases of the retention of *a*, but it is at the cost of creating a formidable body of exceptions, a hundred and thirty-one in number, which have to be provided for by the counter-rules of the next chapter—while, once more, a considerable number of the cases falling under the rule have to be individually specified, partly in that chapter and partly in the two following rules of this, as exceptions under the counter rules It is a complicated process, but it successfully attains at last its purpose

*yasya vihvayasyamñā tatra*²⁸ *viṣve*--- *viṣve*--- *hiranyavarṇīye*²⁹ *yathā*³⁰ *eko*--- *yājyāsu yathā*³¹ *supathā*--- *kāmena*--- *sanīd dīśām* (iv 4 12) *jīmātasya* (iv 6 6) *yad akrando* (iv 6 7) *mā no mitro* (iv 6 8) *ye vājīnam* (iv 6 9) *agner manve* (iv 7 15) *iti*³² *shannām eśhām*³³ *anuvā-kānām mahāprsthīyasamñā tatra*³⁴ *vivasvad*--- *somo* --- *mahe* 'ti *kem prthivī*---

(1) W B *rati* 'ty (2) G M *krāmeno* 'dāhananam (3) G M *upa* only (4) G M *adānām shannām an-* (5) G M *tatra* (6) G M om (7) in O only (8) G M om, W om *yathā* (9) G M om (10) G M om (11) G M *kehitigrahanam*, O adds *tadd* after *syat* (12) O *etiavanmatrasya* (13) G M *mā bhūd*, O *api bhavet* (14) O om (15) G M om, O adds *yathā* (16) G M *ukte*, B adds *kem anyah*, O *etā-vata* 'iam *kem ebhi* (17) G M *atra* 'pr 'ty *adhikopadanam* (18) W O *yā rg*, G M *yā rk*, B *yam rg* (19) W B *svikuroti*, O adds *yathā* (20) G M om (21) G M *ma bhūd iti* (22) G M om (23) W *purvah* (24) G M *iti prāgnasya aditah pañcānu-vakānam*, O *ade* for *atra* (25) O *tatra yathā* (26) G M om (27) G M O om *atra* (28) G M om, O *yathā* (29) G M *-rnah* (30) G M om (31) G M om (32) B om (33) G M put before *shannām* (34) O ins *yathā*

अश्हसोश्हतिरनिष्टतोऽवत्वस्मानवद्यादहनि च ॥४॥

4 Also in *añhasah*, *añhatih*, *anishtrtah*, *avantv asmān*, *avadyāt*, and *ahani*

The cases of non-elision referred to are as follows for *añhasah*, *pramuñcanto no añhasah* (iv 3 13⁵), for *añhatih*, *pari dveshaso añhatih* (ii 6 11²), for *anishtrtah*, *vardhatām te anishtrtah* (iv 1 7²), for *avantv asmān*, *te avantv asmān* (ii 6 12³), with a counter-example, *te no 'vantu pitaro haveshu* (ii 6 12⁴ only G M have *haveshu*), to prove the necessity of giving *asmān* along with *avantv* in the rule, for *avadyāt*, *mitramaho avadyāt* (i 2 14⁶), and for *ahani*, *gucih gukre ahany ojasinā* (iv 4 12¹ G M O stop at *ahani*). All of them occur in passages which are the subject of the preceding rule, and the commentator points out that the "also" (*ca*) of the rule brings forward the implication of those passages, and that to any of the words specified, if occurring elsewhere in the text, the rule does not apply, citing as example *sa evāi 'nam pāpmano 'ñhaso muñcati* (ii 2 7⁴ all but G M stop at *añhasah*). At first sight, then, the rule appears to be a superfluous repetition of part of the cases involved in the preceding one, in fact, however, its value is that of a rehearsal of exceptions under rule xii 4, which teaches that even in the sections above specified, an *a* before a *y*, *v*, *n*, or *h*, if those letters be followed by a vowel, is elided. The only thing calling for explanation about the matter is the connection in which the counter-exceptions are given, which is, to say the least, quite peculiar.

अनु घर्मासत्रापोमर्तोर्ग्यस्त्वोदत्तेवातःपूर्वः ॥५॥

5 Also in *anu*, when preceded by *gharmāsah*, *āpah*, *martah*, *rathah*, *tvah*, *datte*, and *vātah*

This rule belongs, in part, in the same category with the preceding, as pointing out cases in which the *a* of *anu* is retained according to rule 3 of this chapter, notwithstanding the prohibition of rule xii 4, but in part it is of a more general character, since the last two cases lie outside the sections specified in rule 3

4 ¹ *cahāro dhātārātir* (xi 3) *ityādinvishayānvādeṣakah²*
añhasah----- *ity eteshu grahaneshu dhātārātirityādīsthalashv³*
ekārapārvo vāu⁴ 'kārapārvo vā⁵ 'kāro na hupyate yathā⁶
pram----- *pari*----- *van dh*----- *te*----- *asmān iti kim*
te no----- *miti*----- *gucih*----- *yavarahahaparavād⁷*
(xii 4) *eshu pāpyamānālopeshv⁸ alopo 'yam⁹ vihitah anvādeṣah*
kimanthah sa-----

¹ G M ins *eteshu grahaneshu* ² G M -*asthalavish* ³ B adds *antarvartishu*, G M -*lapatishu*, O -*lavartishu* *satsu* ⁴ G M O om *va* ⁵ O om ⁶ G M O om ⁷ W *ratv*, G M -*hasvarapar*- ⁸ G M ins *satsu* ⁹ W om, B na

The commentator explains the phraseology used as signifying that the words rehearsed, having their final *visarga* [with the preceding *a*] converted to *o* [of course, excepting *datte*], have the office of preceding causes—that is, of producing an effect upon the word that follows them, but he gives no hint of the partial suspension of the implication made in the preceding rule, intimating rather, that the cases rehearsed are all of them exceptions under rule xii 4. He quotes the passages, as follows *trayo ghamāso anu* (iv 3 11¹), *tasmād āpo anu sthanu* (v 6 1³), *yadā te marto anu* (iv 6 7³), *anu tvā ratho anu* (iv 6 7³), *pīyati tvo anu tvah* (iv 2 3⁴ only G M have the last word), *śukram ā dutte anuhāya jāryār* (iii 2 2² G M O omit *jāryār*), and *dhanus tad vāto anu vātu te* (v 5 7³ O ends with *anu*). To show that other words than *anu* are not relieved from the action of xii 4, he gives us *amushmin loke vāto 'bhi pavate* (v 4 9⁴ all but G M begin at *vāto*), and further, to show that *anu* retains its *a* only after these words, *anu gāvo 'nu bhagah kanindm* (iv 6 7³ only G M O have the last word).

I have noted ten cases in which the *a* of *anu* is elided under the operation of rule xii 4

अभिवातपञ्च ॥ ६ ॥

6 Also (after *vātaḥ*) in *abhi vātu* and *apah*

The *ca*, 'also,' here brings down as *pārvanimitta* simply *vātaḥ*, the word last specified in the preceding rule. The cases have nothing to do with xi 3 they are *mayobhār vāto abhi vātā 'srāh* (vii 4 17¹ G M omit the first word, and they alone have the last), and *yad vāto āpo agamat* (vii 4 20 O omits *agamat*), and, as counter-examples, the commentator quotes *vāto 'bhi* (v 4 9⁴) to show the necessity of giving *vātu* after *abhi* in the rule, and *avarundhe 'po 'gre 'bhavyāharati* (vi 4 3² G M omit the last two words) to attest the implication conveyed by the *cu*

अन्वगमञ्च ॥ ७ ॥

5 *atra visargāntānām otvam āpunndnām pārvanmittatvam*¹
*iti*² *vijñeyam ghamāsaḥ*----- *ity evampūrva anu ity atrā*
*'kāro na lupyate yathā trayo*³----- *tasmād*----- *yudā*-----
anu----- *pīyati*----- *śukram*----- *dhanus*⁴----- *anu iti*
kim amushmin----- *evampūrva iti kim anu*----- *yavana-*
*haparatvanishedhārtho*⁴ 'yam drambhah

¹ W G M -mittam ² O om ³ a lacuna in B ⁴ G M yavanahasvarapa, O -shedhvnishedhārtho

6 *akāro vāta ity anvādeṣati abhi vātu apah ity etayor*
*akāro vātātpūvo na*¹ *lupyate mayo*----- *vātu iti kim vāto*
----- *'yad*-----² *anvādeṣena kim ava*-----

¹ G M ins *khalu* ² G M, put before *vātu* etc

7 Also (after *āpah*) in *anu* and *agamāt*

Here, again, the *ca*, 'also,' brings forward only the last word in the preceding rule, namely *āpah*—and what is more, gives that word a new character, changing it from *nimittin* to *nimitta* or affecting cause. Of this the commentator takes no notice, and we are doubtless to regard it as quite in order, and as merely adding another to the formidable list of uncertainties involved in the curious system of *anuvṛtti* or continued implication. The passages had in view are *apo anu acāriṣhum* (i 4 45³, 46² B reads *apo adyā 'nu*, which is the version of the Rig-Veda, i 23 23) and *apo agamāt undāsiya* (ii 1 20), as counter-example, is given *paçavo 'nā 'd āyan* (ii 1 5¹), to prove the implication of *āpah*.

आपःपूर्वा ऽद्विपानपादस्मान् ॥ ८ ॥

8 Also in *adbhūh*, *apām napāt*, and *asmān*, when preceded by *āpah*

The passages are *sam āpo adbhūr agmata* (i 1 8), *devīr āpo apām napāt* (i 2 3³ ii 1 4⁹, 4 3³), and *āpo asmān mātaraḥ gundhantu* (i 2 1¹ O omits *gundhantu*). The necessity of specifying *napāt* after *apām* is shown by *vārunīr āpo 'pam ca* (ii 1 9²), and the restriction to preceding *āpah* by *so 'smān pātu* (v 5 5¹).

रायेसइन्द्रःपूर्वश्चाकारपरे ॥ ९ ॥

9 In *asmān*, also, if followed by *a*, when *rāye*, *sah*, and *mārah* precede

The *ca*, 'also,' again brings down the word last mentioned in the preceding rule. The passages for *sah* and *mārah* are *mā so asmān avahāya* (v 7 9¹) and *indro asmān asman dvitiye* (iii 1 9² O omits *dvitiye*) and other cases of *asmān* after *sah* are to be found at i 6 6⁴ and iii 2 7². As counter-examples, are given *so 'smān pātu* (v 5 5¹), to show that the *asmān* must be followed by *a*, and *smo 'smān amutra* (vi 6 1⁴ all the MSS of the commentary have the false reading *so 'smān*, such a phrase would be precisely out of place here as illustration), to show that it is only

7 *apa iti cakāno 'nvāḍigati anu agamat ity etayor akāno 'na khalv' āpahpārvo lupyate apo anv----- apo ag----- evampārva iti kim paçavo---*

(1) G M O om *khalv*, and put *na* next before *lupyate*

8 *adbhūh----- eteshv' akāra āpahpārvo na lupyate sam --- devī----- napāt iti kim vārunīr -- āpo----- evampārva iti kim so----*

¹ G M *eshv*, O *eshu grahaneshv*

after the words specified that *asmān*, even before *a*, remains unmutated

The other case, that of preceding *rāye*, makes more difficulty, since the *samhitā* contains no passage in which *asmān*, when itself followed by *a*, has *rāye* before it. The commentator first declares the passage had in view to belong to another text (*śākhā*), but adds, as an alternative explanation, that the precept relates to the *ṛatā*-text, where we read *rāye asmān asmān rāye rāye asmān* (1 1 14³, 4 43¹). He proceeds further to say that, in case any one objects that in the *samhitā* form of the passage the example does not hold good, since *asmān* is not there followed by *a* (it reads *rāye asmān vṛcān*), he shall reply that the case is one falling under 1 61. It is there taught, namely, that a passage of three words or more, if repeated in the text, reads as it read on its first occurrence. Now the one in question first appears in 1 1 14, which is a *yāgyā* section, and hence the *a* of *asmān* is retained by xi 3, at 1 4 43, then, its retention is assured. But then there ought to be no necessity for specially establishing its retention in *ṛatā*, any more than in any other case where an *a* is retained in *samhitā*. This difficulty the commentator evidently perceives, although he does not state it, for otherwise the *ṛatā* explanation would have satisfied him, and he would never have thought of suggesting another *śākhā*. The difficulty really remains unsolved, and a serious one. Either there was a blunder on the part of the makers of the treatise, or a passage not contained in the present *Samhitā* was contemplated by them. I incline to think the former more likely.

तेपूर्वे अन्धोऽङ्गुरमे ॥ १० ॥

10 Also in *adya*, *andhak*, *aṅguh*, and *agne*, when *te* precedes

The commentator quotes the passages, as follows: *paṣum paṣupate te adya* (11 1 4¹ W O omit *paṣum*), *upo te andhak* (1 4 4 and 11 4 2¹), *aṅgunā te aṅguh* (1 2 6 B omits the example), and *ṛat te agne tejas tena* (11 5 3² only B has *tena*). Counter-examples are, first, to show that only these words keep their *a* after *te*, *te gnaye piavate* (11 4 1² B has a corrupted reading, *te enum*, and W a lacuna to the end of the comment, putting in place of it an example from under the next rule, *tena tvā dadhe gne aṅguraḥ*),

9 cakāḥ ākṛṣhte 'smāṅgrahane 'kārapare sata' vartamāno 'kāro rāye sa indra ity' evampārvo na lupyate rāyepārvasyo 'dāharanam śākhāntare 'athā vā' jātāyām bhavati ' rāye---- yathā-samhitāyām ' no 'dāharanam akāraparatvābhāvāt' tarhi' katham alopa' iti keci' tripadaḥ abhrtipunaruktatvād iti brāhmaṇa mā ---- indro --- akārapara iti kim, so --- evampārva iti kim sm o --- akārah paro yasmāt¹⁰ tad akāraparam¹⁰ tasmān

¹ in W only ² G M put before 'karapare ³ G M O om ⁴ O om ⁵ G M O ins tu ⁶ W O 'patvādh, G M 'parabdh- ⁷ O tatādh, G M add tadā ⁸ G M lopa ⁹ G M O cet ¹⁰ W tad akām, G M akāraparah

and second, to show that these words do so only after *te*, *prathamō* 'ngu *skandati* (in 8³ only B has *skandati*)

Of *agne* after *te*, the text presents eighteen other cases namely 1 2 11² twice, 4 43², 5 2⁴, 3², 4³, 6 6², 7 6⁴ in 4 10⁵, 5 3² (a second case) v 4 7⁵, 7 4¹, 6³, 8¹ three times vi 2 2⁷, 6 1²

मेपूर्वश्च ॥ ११ ॥

11 In *agne*, also, when preceded by *me*

Only *agne*, the last word of rule 10, is brought down into this. The commentator quotes *yan me agne asya* (1 6 2¹, 10² W B omit *asya*) and *imā me agna ishtakāh* (iv 4 11^{3,4} and v 4 2⁴), and there is another case in iv 4 11⁴. He adds, as usual, a number of counter-examples, of obvious intent they are *tena tvā* " *dadhe* 'gne *aṅgīrah* (1 2 12¹ O omits *aṅgīrah*), *prānaṣ ca me* 'pānah (iv 7 1¹), and *tad aṣakam tan me* 'rādhi (1 6 6³)

अस्याश्चिनापरा च ॥ १२ ॥

12 As also, in *asya*, *acvina*, and *aparā*

That is to say, when these words follow *me*. The passages are *vvyantu devā havisho me asya* (1 5 10³ O begins at *devā*), *punar me acvina yuvam cakshuh* (iii 2 5⁴ W B omit the last word, O the last two), and *yad vā me aparāgatam* (vi 6 7²)

नःपूर्वा ऽसदग्निरघान्तमोऽभ्यस्मिन्नद्यपयि ॥ १३ ॥

13 Also in *asat*, *agnih*, *agha*, *antamah*, *abhi*, *asmin*, and *adya* *pathi*, when preceded by *nah*

The examples are *supārā no asat vacē* (1 2 3¹ and vi 1 4⁴), *ayam no agnir vai vah* (1 3 4¹ and 1 4 46³, there is another case of *no agnih* at v 7 9¹), *rukshā mākur no aghaṣuṣu iṣata* (1 4 2⁴ and

10 *adya*----- *eteshv*¹ *akāras ta ity evampārvo na lupyate yathā*² *paṣum*--- *upo*---- ³*aṅṣund*---- ⁴*yat*---- *eteshv iti kim* ⁵*te*--- ⁶*tepārva iti kim prathamō*-----⁷

¹ O *eshv* ² in W only ³ B om ⁴ W om, and ins *tena tvā* etc

11 ¹*cahāro* ²*gna ity anvādeṣati mepārvo* ³*gna ity atrā* ⁴*kāro*¹ *na lupyate yathā*² *yan*----- *imā*--- *mepārva iti kim tena*----- *anvādeṣena*³ *kim* ⁴*prānaṣ*-----⁵ *tad*-----

¹ B *cahāraṣṣṭe sati agna ity asman akuro ma ity evampurvo*, G M the same, omitting *sati*, O the same, omitting *sati* and the second *iti* ² in W only ³ O *-ṣa iti* ⁴ O om

12 *mepārva iti cahāro* ¹*nvādeṣati asya*----- ²*eteshv*³ *akāro mepārvo na lupyate v-*----- *punar*----- *yud*-----

¹ G M ins *iti* ² O *eshv*

1v 6 6⁴ G M O omit *īcata*), *agne tvam no antamah* (1 5 6³ and 1v 4 4⁸), *svashtim no abhi vasīyah* (111 1 9² G M O omit *vasīyah*), *ṣakshā no asmin* (vii 5 7⁴), and *tebhṛ no adya pathibhṛh sugebhī rakshā ca nah* (vii 5 24 all but W end with *pathibhṛh*) The necessity of including *pathi* in the rule is shown by *no 'dya vasu vasatī 'ti* (11 5 3^{6 7}) Other counter-examples, of obvious intent, are *tasmād aṣvād qardabho 'sattarah* (v 1 2¹ G M omit the first two words), *so 'gnir jātah* (v 1 4¹), *uttarato 'ghāyur abhūdāsati* (v 7 3¹ B O omit the last word), *te 'sminn āchanta* (vii 2 10¹), *namo 'gnaye 'pratividdhāya* (1 5 10¹ the example is found only in G M), and *te nah pāntu te no 'vantu* (1 2 3¹, 8 7¹ 1v 3 3²)

नमःपूर्वी ऽग्नेऽग्नेभ्योऽग्नियाय ॥ १४ ॥

14 Also in *agre*, *aṣvebhyah*, and *agniyāya*, when preceded by *namah*

The passages are *namo agrevadhāya ca* (1v 5 8¹), *namo aṣvebhyo 'ṣvapātibhyah* (1v 5 3² B omits the last word, the whole example is wanting in W), and *namo agniyāya ca* (1v 5 5²) Counter-examples are *apo 'gre 'bhivyāharati* (vi 4 3²) and *namo 'gnaye 'pratividdhāya* (1 5 10¹)

आविन्नःसोमःपूर्वी ऽग्निपरः ॥ १५ ॥

15 Also when *āvinnaḥ* or *somaḥ* precedes and *agni* follows

It may be made a question whether the rule should not read *gniparah* (without sign of omission), and mean 'also an *a* preceded by *āvinnaḥ* or *somaḥ* and followed by *gni*' But the authority of the comment (see below) is decidedly, though not unequivocally, in favor of what I have given, and the construction, though a peculiar one, has its analogies elsewhere in the treatise (compare x 4 etc) The further difficulty remains, however, that the only passages in the text to which the rule can apply read *agnih*, in the nominative singular, after the two words specified, so that there appears to be no reason why we should not have simply '*gnih*', instead of '*gniparah*' This the commentator does not fail to perceive,

13 *asat*..... *eteshv akāro na ity evampārvo na lupyate yathā¹ supārā*.... *ayam*.... *rakshā*.... *agne*.... *svashtim*.... *ṣakshā*.... *tebhṛ*.... *pathi 'ti kim no*.... *nahpārva iti kim tasmād*.... *so*.... *uttarato*.... *te*.... *eteshv iti kim 'namo*....² *te*....

¹ in W only ² in G M only

14 ¹*agre*.....¹ *eteshv akāro namahpārvo nu lupyate namo*....² *namo aṣv*....² *namo agni*.... *namahpārva iti kim apo*.... *eteshv iti kim namo 'gn*....

(¹) O om (²) W om'

and accordingly—resorting, as we cannot well help saying, to one of his usual subterfuges—he declares *agni* (or, according to W B O, *gni*) “a part of a word, intended to include a number of cases occurring in another *śākhā*,” not going so far, however, as to quote any of these cases. I suspect *gniparah* to be either a corruption of *gnih*, or originally intended as equivalent with it.

The passages are *āvinno agnir grhapatiḥ* (18 12²) and *somo agnir upa devāḥ* (11 2 4¹), and the commentator adds counter-examples, so *gnir jātaḥ* (v 1 4¹) and *āvinno 'yam asāu* (18 12²)

धीरासोऽब्धासत्कादशासृषीणांपुत्रशार्यतिष्ठाठःपि-
तारपृथिवीयज्ञासतेयेगृह्णाम्येवाश्एषज्ञेसस्फानोयु-
वयोयःपृष्टेपतिर्वीगोशुष्मःपुवःसमिद्धसृषभःपाथोवचोव-
र्षिष्टेनुषाणोयोरुद्रोवृष्णःपूर्वः ॥ १६ ॥

16 Also *a* is retained when preceded by *dhīn āsah*, *adabdhīśah*, *ekādaśah*, *rshīnām putrah*, *śāryāte*, *ashādhuḥ*, *pitārah*, *prthivī yajñe*, *āsate ye*, *grhṇāmy agne*, *vān eshah*, *yajñe*, *saṁsphānah*, *yuvayor yah*, *prsthē*, *patu vah*, *go*, *cushmah*, *puvah*, *samiddhah*, *rshabhah*, *pāthah*, *vacah*, *vaiśvishthe*, *jushāno*, *yo rudrah*, or *vrshnah*

The passages had in view are quoted as follows *tām dhīn āso anudrōya yajante* (11 9³ G M O omit the last word), *adabdhīśo adābhyam* (11 10² and 11 5 6¹), *ekādaśāso apsuśudah* (14 11), *rshīnām putro adhrājā eshah* (13 7² G M O omit the last word), with a counter-example, *yasya putro jātaḥ* (15 8³, 7 6²), to show the need of including *rshīnām* in the *nimitta*, *yathā śāryāte apibah* (14 18 G M omit *yathā*), *ashādho agnih* (15 10^{1 2}), *tvatpitāro agne devāḥ* (15 10² G M O omit *devāḥ*), *prthivī yajñe asmin* (16 5¹), with a counter example, *te mā 'sminn yajñe* (11 2 4¹), where, as only W B point out, the *jatā*-text shows the mutilation of *asmin* after *yajñe* not preceded by *prthivī* (thus, *asmin yajñe yajñe 'sminn asmin yajñe*), *adhyāsate ye antarikṣhe* (11 5 4³), with *ye prthivyām ye 'ntarikṣhe* (1v 5 11² only O has the first *ye*) as counter-example, *mayi grhṇāmy agne agnim* (v 7 91²), with *ashtāu kṛtvo 'gne 'bhi śhunoti* (vi 4 5¹ O omits *śhunoti*) as counter-example, *idāvdān esho asūa* (16 6⁴ and 11 11¹), with *gulera esho 'nto 'ntam manushyah* (vii 2 7² O stops at

15 *āvinnaḥ somah* ¹ *evampārvo* ² *kāro 'gniparo* ³ *na lupyate agnir* ⁴ *iti padātikadeśah śākhāntare bahūpādānārthah āvinno*
---- *somo* ---- *evampārva* *iti kim* *so* ---- *evampara* *iti*
kim āvinno ----

¹ G M ins *ity* ² G M *agni ity evamparah akaro*, B *akārāh agniparo* ³ W B O *gni*

'ntam) to show the need of *vān*, *itah* *prathamam* *jayñe* *agnih* (u 2 4⁸ only G M have *itah*, without it, also i 3 14⁵) see what is said of this passage, and of the rule as fixing its reading, under i 61, *sañsphāno* *adhi* *rakshatu* (u 3 8²), as counter-example to which, to show that *sphānah* in the rule would not have been enough, is given *gayasphāno* *gnishu* "from another *śākhā*," but the genuineness of the reason is open to doubt, *yuvayor* *yo* *astī* (u 5 4¹) with *yo* *psu* *bhasma* *praveçayati* (v 2 2⁵ only O has the last word) to prove the need of *yuvayoh*, *nākasya* *prsthē* *adhi* *rocane* *dāvah* (u 5 5³ G M O omit *dāvah*, another nearly identical case at u 5 4¹), *yajñapatur* *vo* *atra* (v 7 7¹), with *na* *vo* *'bhāgāni* *havyani* (v 1 1¹ O omits *havyam*) as counter-example, *goargham* *eva* *somam* *kuroti* (v 1 10¹ O omits *-mam* *karoti*, *goargha* occurs twice more in this section, and at v 2 9⁴ we have *goaçva* twice), to which, by rule i 52, *agoargham* (v 1 10¹ three times) is to be added as further example, *uchushmo* *agne* *yajumānāya* *'dhi* (i 6 2² only G M have *edhi*, and O omits also the preceding word, there is a second case, of *nicushinah*, in the same division), *agrepuvo* *agrepuvah* (i 1 5¹), *samiddho* *añjan* (v 1 11¹ and we have *samiddho* *agne* at i 6 6², 7 6⁴ u 5 8⁶), without any counter-example to show that *iddhah* would not have been enough to answer the needs of the rule, *dyām* *rshabho* *antariksham* (i 2 8¹ O omits *dyām*, and G M have, like the Calcutta edition, the false reading *yām*), *preyam* *pātho* *apī* *'hi* (u 3 3³ three times), *ugram* *vaco* *apā* *'vadhīm* (i 2 11² another nearly identical case in the same division), *varshshthe* *adhi* *nāke* (i 1 8 and i 4 43²), *jushāno* *aptur* *āyasya* *vetu* (i 3 4¹ and v 1 3 2² G M omit *vetu*), *yo* *rudh* *o* *agnūdu* *yah* (v 5 9³ G M O omit the last word), and, as counter-example, *yad* *upatrñhyād* *rudro* *'sya* (v 1 3 9³ but O reads *agniyād* for *upatrñhyād*, which makes the reference to i 6 7⁴), and, finally, *vrshno* *açvasya* *samdanam* *asī* (u 4 7², 9⁴ O stops at *açvasya*, which would make the reference include also vi 4 18² twice, and there are further cases of retention after *vrshnah* at i 4 2 and v 1 4 5³)

16 *dhīrāsah*----- *evampūvo* *na*¹ *khalv*¹ *akāro* *hupyate*
*yathā*² *tām*---- *adab*----- *ekād*----- *rshīnām* -- *rshī-*
nām *iti* *kim* *yasya*---- *yathā*---- *ash*--- *tvat*----
prthivī---- *prthivī* *'ti* *kim* *te*---- *'ity* *atra* *jatāyām*⁴ *adhy-*
 ---- *āsata* *iti* *kim* *ye*---- *mayi* --- *grhñānī* *'ti* *kim* *asht-*
 ---- *idāvāñ*----- *vān* *iti* *kim* *gukra*---- *itah*---- *sañs-*
 ---- *sam* *iti* *kim* *gayasphāno* *gnishu* *iti* *śākhāntare* *yuvayor*
 ---- *yuvayor* *iti* *kim* *yo*---- *nākasya*--- *'* *yajña*-----
patur *iti* *kim* *na*---- *yo*---- *apy* *akārādi* (i 52) *vacandā*⁵
agoargham *'ti* *co* *'ddharanam*⁵ *uchushmo*---- *agrepuvo*
 ---- *samiddho*---- *dyām*---- *preyam*---- *ugram*----
varsh--- *jushāno*---- *yo*---- *ya* *iti* *kim* *yad*----
vrshno----

¹ O puts next before *hupyate* ² O om ³ G M O om ⁴ G M O om ⁵ O

अरतिमस्ययज्ञस्यातिद्रुतोऽतियत्यनृणोऽविष्यन्ननमीवां-
 ज्ञेष्वर्चिरजीतानज्यानिमङ्गियाश्चाल्यर्वन्तमस्त्वृणोद-
 झिरोऽप्सुयोश्चस्वभायदच्युतोऽश्वसनिस्त्वभिरशिष्टेदङ्गे-
 ऽघ्निय ॥ १७ ॥

17 Also in *aratim*, *asya yajñasya*, *atidrutah*, *ati yanti*, *anrñah*, *avishyan*, *anamñvah*, *anneshu*, *arcñh*, *ajñtān*, *ajyāñm*, *ahnñyāh*, *ambāh*, *arvantam*, *astu*, *akñnot*, *añgnah*, *apsu yah*, *asñabhāyat*, *acyutah*, *açvasanah*, *astñabhñh*, *acñçret*, *añnge*, and *aghñniya*

The passages had in view are quoted by the commentator as follows, with such counter-examples as are needed to justify the inclusion of more than one *pada* in any case *mārdhānam drvo* *ar atim prthivyāh* (14 13 and 15 2¹ O begins at *drvah*, and it alone has *prthivyāh*), *yan me agne asya yajñasya* (16 2¹, 10²), with the counter-example *ete 'syā 'mushmin* (11 1 10⁵), *pratyaññh somo atidrutah* (18 21 all the MSS here insert the *h* before *somo*, as required by 1 32, and G M even convert it to *kh*, according to 11 12), *paçyanto ati yanti* (11 2 2¹), and, as counter-example to both these last examples, *nañ 'nañ somo 'ti pavate* (11 5 11⁴ O begins at *somo*), *tad agne anrñno bhavāñm* (11 3 8² O omits *bhavāñm*), *na yavase avishyan* (14 4 3³), *svāveço anamñvo bhavāññh* (11 4 10¹ B O omits *bhavāññh*), *ye anneshu vñvidhyanti* (15 5 11¹ O omits the last word), *jātavedo yo arcñh* (17 7 8¹), *çarado ajñtān* (17 7 2³), *teshām yo ajyāñm* (17 7 2³), *tiroahnñyā mā suhñtāh* (11 3 13 O omits *suhñtāh*), *ambe ambāh* (11 4 19^{1,2} twice, ³ twice), *yo arvantam pñghāññsati* (11 4 15 O omits the last word), *bahñs te astu bālññ itñ* (11 3 10² O stops at *astu*, the text furnishes eleven other cases of *astu* with *n* retained, at 1 2 3³, 4 45¹, 8 14² 11 1 14⁴, 2 5⁷, 8² 15 5 9³ twice, 7 2⁴, 4^{3,4}), *itñ indro*.

17. *aratim*-----¹ *eteshñ akāro 'na kñalv² ekārapūrvñ okāra-*
pūrvñ vā lupyate yathā³ mārdh----- yan----- yajñasye 'ti
kim ete----- pratyaññ----- paçy----- drtoyantñ 'ty ābhñyām⁴
kim nāñ----- tad----- na----- svāv----- ye----- jātā-
vedo----- çarado----- teshām----- tiro----- ambe-----
yo----- bahñs----- itñ----- agne----- yo----- ya itñ kim
açvo----- yo----- madāyñ----- yo----- sanññ itñ kim
açvebhñyo----- indro----- bhññ⁵ itñ kim⁶ çam----- ity atrā⁷
jātñyām⁸ astñabhñyo----- varuno----- añnge----- aghñniye
'ty akāraqrññtāh padāññkadeco bahñpādāññrññthāh etāññ-----
yād----- payo-----

¹ G M om the enumeration, and in *itñ* ⁽²⁾ G M om *kñalv*, and put *na* next before *lupyate* ⁽³⁾ G M O om ⁽⁴⁾ B *tñbhñyām*, G M *etābhñyām* ⁽⁵⁾ B G M *astñabhññ* ⁽⁶⁾ O om ⁽⁷⁾ B om

akṛnot (11 12), *agne añgiro yo 'syām* (12 12¹ there is another case in the same division, and one it 11 2 7³), *yo apsu ya osha-dhishu* (v 5 9³), with the count 1 example *agvo psu vetasah* (v 3 12² but O gives instead *yo 'psu bhasma*, v 2 2³), *yo askabhāyad uttarām* (12 13³ G M O omit *uttarām*), *madaya vso acyutah* (12 6), *yo bhaksho aṣvasanīh* (11 2 5⁷), and, as counter-example, *agvebhyo 'ṣvapatribhyag ca* (iv 5 3² only O has *ca*), *indro dadhuco asthabhir iti* (v 6 6³ O omits *iti*), and a counter-example from the *jatā*-text of the passage *gam asthabhyo mayabhyah* (v 2 12² O omits), namely *asthabhyo mayabhyo mayabhyo 'sthabhyo 'sthabhyo mayabhyah* (G M give simply *mayabhyo 'sthabhyah*), *varuno agicret* (18 10²), *añge-añge ni dedhyat* (13 10¹ and vi 3 11² it would have been better to include in the example the preceding word *prāno*, to show that the first *añge*, as well as the second, furnishes an example under the rule, there is another like pair of cases, after *apāno*, in 13 10¹), and finally, it is explained that the quotation of *aghniya* with final *a* makes it (by 122) a part of a word, intended to include a variety of cases, and three such cases (being all that the text contains) are quoted namely *etāni te aghniye nāmāni* (vii 1 6³), *yad āpo aghniya ranune 'ti capu mahe* (13 11 B omits the last word, G M O the last three), and *payo aghniyāsu hrtsu* (12 8¹ O omits *hrtsu*, which would make the citation include also vi 1 11³) This exposition seems to prove that the proper reading at the end of the rule is *aghniya*, and I have ventured to adopt it, though all the MSS (except T, which is ambiguous, running rules 17 and 18 together in *sandhi*) give *aghniyā* *Aghniyā* would answer as including *aghniyāsu*, but it would not include also *aghniye*

अधर स्वरपरे ॥ १८ ॥

18 Also in *adhvara*, when a vowel follows [the *r*]

The examples given in illustration of the rule are *satyadharmāno adhvarā* (12 1²), *haviṣmān devo adhvarah* (13 12), and *upaprayanto adhvaram ity dha* (15 7¹). In regard to the last of them, it is remarked that rule 161 is not of force for it, since the conditions imposed by that rule do not arise in it. The rule, namely, directs that a passage of three words or more, being repeated in the text, is to be read as where it first occurred; now *upaprayanto adhvaram* was found at 15 5¹, where the retention of the *a* comes under rule 3 of this chapter, but here only two

18 *adhvara ity asmin¹ grahane svarapare² vartamāno³ 'kīro⁴ 'na khalv⁵ ekāraṇīkārūpārvo⁶ kṛpyate. satya-.... haviṣmān
.... upa-.... atra⁷ tripadaprabhīti⁸ (161) nyāye nu prasaratī⁹ tāllakṣhaṇāmbhāvāt svarapara itī kim¹⁰ ṣuq ..
andho-....*

¹ G M *efasmin* ² O *us' sah* ³ G M om ⁴ G M O *ekārapu va ukhā apūro va*, G M adds *na*, B adds *vā* ⁵ M *tatra*, ⁶ B *sarata*,

words, instead of three, are cited in the repetition. As counter-examples, showing the value of the restriction "when a vowel follows," are given *gug vā agniḥ so 'dhvaryum* (v 6 2⁴) and *andho 'dhvaryuḥ syāt* (v 1 3¹ and vi 1 8³). O alone has *syāt*, and, without that addition, the phrase is found also at v 1 3²). This proves that what is to be "followed by a vowel" is the *r* of *adhvara*, but how that meaning is conveyed by the terms of the rule is not easy to discover. The MSS are at variance as to the reading of the first word of the rule, T W B O giving *adhvara*, and G M *adhvare*, between which I am at a loss to decide confidently, because neither of them appears to be what is wanted. But I prefer *adhvara*, both because it is better supported, and because it is not the usage of the treatise to put in a case-form the words or themes which it cites from the text.

An additional case falling under the rule is *udhvo adhvarah* (i 1 12), and yet others (as i 5 5¹ twice, and, doubtless, i 4 46^{2 3}), to which it would else apply, are disposed of under the general rule x1 3.

स पूर्वस्यार्धसदृशमेकेषामर्धसदृशमेकेषाम् ॥ ११ ॥

19 In the opinion of some, it becomes half-similar with its predecessor

This is a very blind precept, and we are permitted to doubt whether its purport is interpreted aright by the commentary, in which, moreover, there are peculiar and unintelligent variations of reading. What letter is the subject of the rule—the elided *a*, or the non-elided? The comment says the latter (although the majority of MSS blunderingly say the "non-protracted" instead), and states that it acquires a quantity similar to half a *mora*, or becomes one and a half *moras* long. It is added, that no special examples are given, because such would not bring to light any difference (? only O has the reading that means this. W B omit the "not," G M are unintelligible). This appears to me quite unsatisfactory. The distinct demonstrative *sa* in the rule ought to point back to something distinctly stated above, and that is the

19 *yo 'yam akāro 'luptah¹ sa pūrvasyā² 'lādrasyā³ 'kdrasyā⁴ vā 'rāhamātrasadr̥ṣam⁵ kalam bhayata⁶ ity ekeshām rshānām⁷ matam⁸ 'adhyardhamātrah syād⁹ ity arthah uktāny evo 'dāhuranāni vīṣeshādarṣanāt¹⁰ andhena sadṛṣo 'ādhasadr̥ṣah¹¹ tam ardhhasadr̥ṣam¹²*

ite tribhāshyaratne prātigākhyavivaraṇa¹¹
ekādaśo 'dhyāyah¹²

¹ W B O *aphutah* ⁽²⁾ G M *ekāraokārapurvasya* ³ W *tram sad*, G M *-trāsad* ⁴ G M *labhata* ⁵ O *ācāryānām* ⁶ O *om* ⁽⁷⁾ W O *-trasyam*, B G M *-tra syād* ⁸ W B *-shādar-*, G M *darṣanāt* ⁹ G M *yah* ¹⁰ O *om* ¹¹ O *ms prathamapragne* ¹² G M *add prīkshnāya namaḥ*

akāra which in rule 1 is said to be dropped after certain "predecessors" We have had no *akāra alūpta* spoken of, but only cases of *alopa* of *akāra* And it seems to be taught here, in accordance with the doctrines of all the other Pratīṣākhyas (see note to Ath P1 in 53), that some regard the *a* as (not elided, but) so absorbed into the preceding diphthong as to become assimilated to, or identified with, the latter half of that diphthong We may with plausibility conjecture the rule to be a later addition to the original substance of the chapter

CHAPTER XII

CONTENTS 1-8, elision and non elision of initial *a* after final *e* or *o* in exceptional and special cases, 9-11, resulting accent

अथ लोपः ॥ १ ॥

1 Now for cases of elision

This is a general heading to the chapter (that is to say, to its first eight rules), which, as the commentator points out, has for its sphere of action the passages specified in rule 3 of the preceding chapter This is a matter of course the general rule (by x11) being elision, there can be need of an additional authority for elision only where that rule is contravened by another of opposing character, and of wider application than to specific cases only

असि ॥ २ ॥

2 The *a* of *asi* is elided

The examples given are *suparno 'si garutmān* (iv 110⁵, 6 5³ v 110⁵ O omits the last word) and *pratho 'si prthivy asi* (iv 2 9¹ O stops at 'si) The elision is not infrequent in this word, usually occurring in the little prose phrases which are inserted among the verses in the sections concerned, I have noted eighteen other cases but they are hardly worth detailed reference

न गर्भःसंनद्धोयमोभद्रःपूर्वः ॥ ३ ॥

1 *athe 'ty ayam adhikārah akārasya lopu ucyata ity etad adhikrtam veditavyam ita uttamam yad vakshyāmah dhātārātir* (x1 3) *ityādviśhayo 'yam adhyāyārambhah*¹

¹ G M *etadaah-*

2 *asi 'ty asminn akāro lupyata ekārāukārapārvaḥ. yathā suparno ---- pratho ----*

¹ G M *-ro vā* ² in B only

3 But not when *garbhah*, *samnaddhah*, *yamah*, or *bhadrāh* precedes

The examples quoted by the commentator are *garbho asy osha-dhīnām* (iv 2 3³), *samnaddho asi vīdayasva* (iv 6 6⁵), *asi yamo asy ādityah* (iv 6 7¹ G M O omits the last word), and *tvaṁ bhadro asi kratuh* (iv 3 13¹) There is another case of *asi* after *garbhah* at iv 1 4², which is then repeated at v 1 5³, the *a* standing this time unelided by rule 1 61

As usual, the commentator thinks it necessary to account for the inclusion of the double *pada sam naddhah*, instead of simply *naddhah*, in the rule Some, he says, quote as counter-example *upanaddho 'surah* (iv 4 9), but its propriety is questionable, since the passage does not fall under xi 3, and moreover, there is no *asi* in it (O has the good sense to pass without notice this most absurd suggestion), and the valid counter example is to be sought in another *cākhā* We have here an unusually clear example of the arbitrary way in which the plea *cākhāntare* is resorted to, in order to avoid the attribution of a slight inconsistency to the treatise makers.

यवनहपरः स्वरपरेषु ॥ ४ ॥

4 A is elided before *y*, *v*, *n*, and *h*, when these are followed by a vowel

The examples given are *hranyagrāgo 'yo asya pādāh* (iv 6 7⁴ O omits *pādāh*), *vunaspate 'va sryā rarānah* (iv 1 8³ O omits *rarānah*), *vai enyo 'nu prayānam* (iv 1 10⁴), and *yambhayanto 'hm vrkam* (iv 1 7 8² O omits *vrkam*) These are but specimens selected from among a considerable number of cases namely, before *y*, two, before *v*, nineteen, before *o*, fourteen (all but three of them, cases of *anu*, the counter-exceptions to which form in part the subject of xi 5), before *h* (which, as the counter-exceptions noted in xi 4 show, includes also *ñh*), five, in all, forty To show the necessity of the restriction "when these are followed by a vowel," are cited *gukram te anyat* (iv 1 11²) and *agre ahnāñ hitah* (iv 1 3⁴ O omits *hitah*)

There is a well-established difference of reading here in the rule itself T B G M have *yavanaha svarupareṣu*, only W and O adding *para* (which I have amended to *parah*) after *ha* So also,

3 *garbhah*-----¹ *evampūrvah sāmudhyāl labdhe 'si² 'ty as-mun grahane³ 'kāno⁴ 'na⁵ lupyate garbho---- samnaddho ---- 'sam itī kim upan----- itī kecid udāharanti tac cint-yam dhātārātīr (xi 3) ityādyantahpātītvābhāvād asīcābdā-darṣānāc 'ca mukhyam tu⁶ cākhāntare vijñeyam pratyudāhara-nam⁷ asi----- tvam-----*

¹ G M ins *ity* ² W *tasmun asi* ³ B O om ⁴ G M ins *ekārapūrvā okara pūrvā vā* ⁵ B om ⁶ O *sūpy udāharanam cākhāntare* ⁷ W *cā mukhyam kim tu*

where the rule is quoted under 121, W alone (there is no O for that part of the work) introduces *para*, under xi 4 and 5, W and B alike have *yavanahaparatva* etc, but the testimony as to the rule is equivocal, since *para* might well have been added there by way of exposition instead of quotation. I have, as usual, followed W, although not without suspicion that the *para* is a gloss, introduced to help the otherwise blind and inaccurate phraseology of the rule—which latter, however, is not altogether discordant with the usage of the treatise elsewhere.

The exceptions under this rule, instead of being rehearsed after it, as is the general habit of the Prāṭicākhya, are given in rules 4 and 5 of the preceding chapter, and, in the latter rule, mingled with instances of a wholly different character. Here, then, a particular specification of cases already included under a general rule is regarded as insuring against inclusion in a more general statement of exceptions under that rule. I believe that the treatise offers no other example of this canon of interpretation.

नकारग्रपर उदात्तः ॥ ५ ॥

5 Before *j* and *gn*, *a* is elided if acute

The examples are *ojo* 'jāyathāh (16 12⁴) and *gucih* pāvaka vandyo 'gne (13 14⁵), and the counter-examples, of *a* unaccented remaining unelided, are *nā tatrshānō ajārah* (iv 6 1²) and *nidhi-pātūr no agnīh* (14 44¹). There is, as the examples show, a real reason in the accent *ajāyathah* and *agne* are both words that are accented only at the beginning of a *pāda*, where (as remarked under xi 1) the elision of *a* is an almost universal rule. All the other cases of elision before *gn* (nine in number) are of the same kind, not, however, those before *j* (only two)

मोवचोदधानस्येपूर्वश्च ॥ ६ ॥

6 Before *gn*, also when preceded by *mah*, *vacah*, *dadhānah*, and *sīhe*

The *ca*, 'also,' of this rule, brings down simply *gn* from its predecessor, the intent being to point out the cases where the *a* of *agni* is elided even when unaccented. *Mah*, it is stated, is a part

4 ¹ *yakādravakāranakārahakān aparo* 'kāro² *lupyate teshu yakā-rādīshu svarapareshu satsu hīrān----* *vanas----* *varenyo*
---- *jambh----* *svraparesho³ iti kim sukram----* *agre*
-----⁴

¹ G M ms *ekāraakārapūrva akārah* ² G M om ³ O *para* ⁴ G M add *evam āde*

5 *yakādraparo¹ gnaparag* cā 'kāra² *udātto lupyate ojo-----*
gucih---- *udātta iti kim na----* *nidhi-----*

¹ G M *yakārag* *ca* ² O puts after *udātto*

of a word, so given for the sake of conciseness, and including the two cases *aṅgrasvad aḥe 'mo 'gnim* and *aṅgrasvad bharishyāmo 'gnim* (both iv 1 2² O omits *aṅgrasvad* in each) The other passages had in view by the rule are *vaco 'gnaye bharatā brhat* (iii 2 11¹ O omits the last two words), *dadhāno 'gnir hotā* (iv 1 3⁴), and *sadhasthe 'gnim purishyam* (iv 1 3¹ O omits *purishyam*) To prove the implication of *gn* only, is given *sadhasthe adhy uttarasmin* (iv 6 5³, 7 13⁴ v 7 7² O omits)

By xi 16, *vacah* does not as a general thing elide the following *a*, but there is no clashing between the two rules, as they have reference to different parts of the text

अभ्यावर्तिन्नूपमपिदाम्यद्यान्वदितिःशर्माग्नेर्जिह्वामग्र-
यःपप्रयोऽस्माकमस्मेधत्ताश्माश्चाश्रुतिरश्यामामार्यमन्नस्म-
त्पाशानस्मिन्यज्ञेऽस्ताव्यथमानामिद्रोहमधायदोऽथोऽडु-
ग्धाअरिष्टाअथाअर्चत्यन्तरस्यामत्रस्थानायाङ्गिरस्वदकरम्

॥ ७ ॥

7 The *a* is elided in *abhyāvartin*, *apūpam*, *api dadhāmi*, *adyā 'nu*, *aditih çarma*, *agner jihvām*, *agnayah paprayah*, *asmākam*, *asine dhatta*, *açmā*, *açvā* wherever found, *acyāma*, *amā*, *aryaman*, *asmatpāçm*, *asmin yajñe*, *astā*, *avyathamānā*, *abhadroham*, *adhāy*, *adah*, *atho*, *adugdhāh*, *arishthāh*, *arathāh*, *arcanti*, *antar asyām*, *atra stha*, *annāya*, *aṅgrasvat*, and *akaram*

The commentator gives an example for each specification of the rule, with counter-examples for every case in which more than one *pada* is taken, as follows *agne 'bhyāvartin* (iv 2 1²), and, as counter-example, *hānena kṛto abhy āmad arkam* (i 1 14² G M omit the last word, O the last two), *bhadraçoce 'pūpam deva* (iv 2 2³ only W has *deva*), *agne 'pi dadhāmy āsyē* (iv 1 10²), and, as counter-example, *baddho apikaksha āsani* (i 7 8³ O omits the last word), *'nu no 'dyā 'numatih* (iii 3 11³ iv 4 12⁵, 7 15⁵), and, as counter-example, *pra tat te adya çiprivishṭa nāma* (ii 2 12⁵ O ends with *adya*, and G M substitute another passage,

6 *gnapara iti cakāro jñāpayati mah----- ity evampūrvvo gnapuro 'nudātto 'py' 2akāralopo bhavati, 3 yuthā3 aṅgr----- ma ity 4atra padārikadeçagrahanam 5 samkshepārtham aṅgir----- vaco----- dadhāno----- sadhasthe----- 6anvādeçah kīmarthah 6 sadh----- gnaparasyā 7kārasyā8 9nudāttārtho 10yam ārambhah*

(1) in W only (2) G M O *akāro jñāpayati* (3) in W only (4) G M *apadagrahanam* (5) G M *anvādeçena kim*, O om, along with the following example (6) in W only

namely *viṣve adya marutaḥ*, iv 7 12¹), *adhi bravītu no 'ditiḥ śarma yachatu* (iv 6 6⁴ G M O omit the first two words), and, as counter-example, *yathā no aditiḥ karatī* (iii 4 11² only O has *karatī* [reading it *karat*], G M substitute a *jatā* reading, *aditir no no aditir aditir nah*, without anything to show whether it is put forward as the *jatā*-text of this passage, or of another, occurring at iv 6 9⁴, where the *samhitā* likewise reads *no aditiḥ*), *adhvaram no 'gner jhivām abhi grṇitam* (iv 1 8² B omits the last word, O the last two, G M the last and first), and, as counter-example, *vratā dadante agneḥ* (iv 1 8²), *te no 'gnayah paprayah* (i 7 7²), and, as counter-example, *purishyāso agnayah prāvanebhūh* (iv 2 4³ G M omit the last word), *naro 'smākam indra* (iv 6 6⁷, there are two other cases, at iii 2 8⁶ and iv 6 4³), *viṣve 'sme dhatta* (i 4 44²), with the counter-example *dravinam vājo asme vājasya mā* (iv 7 12¹ only B has *mā*, and G M O end at *asme*), *pari vrñdhi no 'gmā bhavatu nas tanāḥ* (iv 6 6⁴ G M end with 'gmā, and only O has the last two words), for the phonetic complex *agvā* however followed, *vrshapānayo 'gvā rathebhūh* (iv 6 6³ O omits after 'gvā), *pracetaso 'gvān* (iv 6 6⁵), and *bharanto 'gvāye 'va* (iv 1 10¹ O omits this example), with two counter-examples, *cashālam ye aṣvayūpāya takshatī* (iv 6 8² O alone has the last word, and it omits the first) and *kshatram no aṣvo vanatām* (iv 6 9⁴ O omits *vanatām*), to show that *aṣva* would not have answered the purpose instead of *agvā*, *vājayanto 'gyāna dyumnā* (i 3 14³ G M omit *dyumnā*), *pūnas te 'māi 'shām* (iv 7 14³), *ye te 'ryaman* (ii 3 14⁴), *te 'smatpācān* (iv 3 13⁴), with the counter-example *anyam te asmat tapantu* (iv 6 1^{3,5} v 4 4⁵ only O has *tapantu*), *yah pitā te 'smiṇ yajñe* (ii 6 12⁶), with the counter-example *te asmiṇ javam ā 'dadhuh* (i 7 7²), *prasitīm drūnāno 'stā*

7 *abhyāvartin*----- *eteshv akāro lupyate ekārdukarapārvaḥ*¹
*yathā*² *agnē*---- *āvartinn*³ *iti kim kāmēna*---- *bhadra-*
goce---- *agne*---- *dadhāmī* 'ti *kim baddho*---- *anu*----
anv iti kim pra---- *adhi*---- *śarme* 'ti *kim yathā*----
adhv---- *jhivām* *iti kim vratā*---- *te*---- *papraya* *iti*
kim purish---- *naro*---- *viṣve*---- *dhate* 'ti *kim drav*-
---- *pari*---- ⁴ *aṣve 'ty asya*⁵ *yatrayatratra grutis*⁶ *tatratatratra*
lopah vrsha---- *grutir* *iti kim prace*---- *bhar*---- *dir-*
ghagrahanena ' *kim cashālam*---- *kshatram*---- *vājay*-
---- *pūnas*---- *ye*---- *te*---- *pācān* *iti kim anyam*----
yah---- *yajña* *iti kim* *te*---- *prasitīm*---- *mā*---- *jane* *
---- *droham* *iti kim brhas*---- *upa*---- *ye*---- *ma-*
hyam---- *śūra*---- *pūrve*---- *ye*---- *gāya*---- *abhi*
---- *asyām* *iti kim rukmo*---- *ye*---- *sthe* 'ti *kim tva-*
shatā---- *rāyas*---- *prthivyāḥ*---- *āham*----

¹ G M put before *lupyate*, and add *vā* ² G M O om ³ W *abhyāv-* ⁴ O ms *aṣvā grutis* ⁵ G M O om ⁶ G M *grūyate* ⁷ G M ms *iti*

's₂ (12 14¹ O omits *prasūtim*), *mā suparno 'vyathamānā* (iv 2 9¹), *jane 'bhidroham manushyāh* (iii 4 11⁶ O omits *manushyāh*), with a counter-example, *brhaspate abhigaster amuñcah* (iv 1 7⁴ only W has *amuñcah*), *upa prā 'gāt sumanme 'dhāya manma* (iv 6 8³ all but O begin at *sum-*, and G M end with *'dhāya*), *ye 'do rocane divah* (iv 2 8³ O omits *divah*), *mahyam agne 'tho sīda* (iv 1 9³, 2 1⁵), *gūra nonumo 'dugdhāh* (ii 4 14²), *pūrve 'rshtāh syāma* (iv 7 14² all the MSS read *-shā*), *ye pavayo 'rathāh* (i 6 12⁵ only G M have *ye*), *gāyatrino 'rcanty arkam* (i 6 12³ only G M have *arkam*), *abhi gūcūco 'ntar asyām* (iv 1 9³, another case at iv 2 3³), with the counter-example *rukmo antar vī bhāti* (iv 1 10⁴ 5 et al), *ye 'tra stha purānāh* (iv 2 4¹), with the counter-example *tvastā no atra varivah* (i 4 44¹), *rāyas posho 'nnāya tvā* (i 7 9³ O omits *tvā*), *prthivyāh sadhasthe 'ngirasvat* (iv 1 6^{1,2} four times, other cases at iv 1 1^{3,4} three times), and *aham tebhya 'karam namah* (iv 5 1³)

गाहमानोजायमानोक्षेतयोमन्यमानोवनस्पतिभ्यःपते-
स्त्रिस्तपसःस्वधावोभामितोऽग्नयत्रायोऽध्वर्योऽक्रतोपूर्वः

॥ ८ ॥

8 An *a* is elided when preceded by *gāhamānah*, *jāyamānah*, *hetayah*, *manyamānah*, *vanaspatibhyah*, *pate*, *sṛdhah*, *tapasah*, *svadhāvah*, *bhāmatah*, *agnayah*, *āyo*, *adhvaryo*, and *krato*

The quoted passages are *gāhamāno 'dāyah* (iv 6 4²), *jāyamāno 'hnam ketuh* (ii 4 14¹), *hetayo 'nyam asmat* (iv 5 10⁵), *manyamāno 'mariyam* (i 4 46¹), *vanaspatibhyo 'dhi sambhrtām* (iv 6 1¹ O omits the last word), with the counter-example *namah pitrbhyo abhi* (iii 2 8³), *annapate 'nnasya* (iv 2 3¹ and [by 161] v 2 2¹), *nīho atī sṛdhō 'ty acittim* (iv 1 7³ O omits the first two words), *tapaso 'dhi jātah* (iv 2 10⁴), *deva svadhāvo 'mrtasya dhāma* (iii 1 11⁶ O omits the first word and the last), with the counter-example *anyā vo anyām avatu* (iv 2 6³ O omits the last word), *bhāmato 'mitrasyā 'bhīdsatah* (i 6 12⁵ O omits the last word), *yān agnayo 'nvatapyanta* (iii 2 8³ O omits *yān*), *agne 'dadbhāyo 'stātano* (i 1 13⁵ O omits *agne*), *adhvaryo 'ver apāśh* (vi 4 3⁴ O ends at *'veh*), and *catākrato 'nu te dāya* (ii 5 12⁵)

A special explanation is required for the passage in which *agnayah* occurs, since the following *pada* is *anu*, which might seem to

8 *gāhamānah*----- *ity evampūrvo*⁴ *'kāro lupyate yathā*²
gāh---- *jāy*---- *hetayo* --- *many*---- *vanas*----
vanaspati 'ti kim namah anna---- *nīho*---- *tapaso*
---- *deva*---- *svadhe* 'ti kim anyā---- *bhāmato*----
yān--- *ukārusya vakāravikṛyāyām vyañjanaparo nakāra*³ *'iti*
yavanaha (xii 4) *nishedhābhāvād alope prāpte tadapavādo*

fall under xii.4 Its inclusion here is necessary, because in *samhitā* the word becomes *anv*, so that its *n* is no longer "followed by a vowel," as required by that rule. The question might arise, whether rule 151 would not, at any rate, cause *anv* to be implied along with *anu*, but the commentator does not raise it, and the course taken by the treatise is evidently the more reasonable and safer one.

The last three cases which the rule deals with are of a peculiar character, and quite different from all the rest falling under this chapter, being those in which a final *pragraha* or uncombinable vowel elides an initial *a*, either in the passages specified in xi 3 (like the last of the three) or elsewhere (like the other two). This the commentator points out, and declares that in every other instance the *a* remains after a *pragraha*. I have already noticed (under iv 6,7) what the usage of the text is after *pragrahas* in *o* that, against the two cases here mentioned of *a* elided after a vocative in *o*, there are but two in which the *a* remains, but that after a final *o* containing the particle *u* we have twenty-one cases of *a* retained, and no case of its elision. The passages where *a* is retained after an *e* that is *pragraha*, I have omitted to note but there is a considerable number of them, including many (e.g. 14 30 11 5 6⁵ vi 3 5³ vii 5 3² the commentator cites a single one, *me agvina samvatsarah*, v 6 4¹) where the retention is not otherwise authorized so that inability to cause elision is unquestionably involved in the very character of a *pragraha* vowel, according to the view of the treatise, and needs not to be expressly stated. At this we have a right to be surprised, especially for two reasons first, that it is thought necessary to teach (see x 24) that *pragrahas* are not liable in general to combination with the initial vowels that follow them, and secondly, that according to this treatise there is no combination of the initial *a* with the preceding *e* or *o*, but an actual loss of it, leaving the *e* or *o* unaffected (except sometimes as to accent). But the essential character of the *pragraha* vowels, the reason of their peculiar treatment, and the proper significance of the term by which they are called, are obscure points as yet in Hindu phonetics and nomenclature.

It remains to inquire how complete and accurate is the enumeration by the Prātīcākhya of the cases of elision or non-elision of *a* occurring in the Tāttirīya Sāhitā. I have, in looking through the Sāhitā, carefully considered every case with reference to the rules of the treatise, and the result is that, apart from *ye aparīkṣu*

'yam agne---- adhvaryo---- śatukrato---- atra yavanaha (xii 4) ityādindī 'va lope siddhe punar asya grahanam nyamārtham āyo 'dhvaryo' krato ity etutpadatrayapūrvasyā 'vā' 'kdrasya' lopo na tv itarapragrahapūrvasye' 'ti yathā me----

¹ G M -vas tv ² G M O om ³ B rapara ⁴ O ādh- ⁵ B om ⁶ O kdra.
⁷ B itaratra pr-

(1433) already treated of under xi 3 (p 244), I have found only two cases of *a* retained which are not accounted for namely *urdhvo asthāt* (v 2 1⁵, R-V x 11) and so *agnih* (v 2 3³, R-V vii 1 16), and both these I suspect to fall under 161, I having failed to note the previous occurrence of the passages. Of cases explained by 161 there is a considerable number, only, as was remarked under that rule (see p 47), there are three among them to which, if the commentator's forced interpretation of its terms be admitted, it cannot be made to apply. Of cases of elision of *a* unaccounted for, I have found none. Of course, my examination of the *Sanhita*, having been made by the help of a single *samhitā* manuscript, is not to be credited as absolutely accurate yet I have a good deal of faith in the trustworthiness of its result.

तस्मिन्ननुदात्ते पूर्व उदात्तः स्वरितम् ॥ १ ॥

9 When the elided *a* is grave, the preceding diphthong, if acute, becomes circumflex.

All the Prātisākhya's, and the usage of the known Vedic texts, are in accord upon this point (see note to Ath Pr iii 55). To the particular circumflex hence resulting, the treatise gives later (xx 4) the name *abhinīhata*, the others call it *abhinīhita*. The examples given are *tē 'bruvan* (ii 5 1³ et al) and *sō 'bravīt* (ii 1 2¹ et al).

The representation of the tone of the elided *a* in the resulting accent of the eliding diphthong, of course, favors the view that regards it as absorbed into the latter, rather than elided.

उदात्ते चानुदात्त उदात्तम् ॥ १० ॥

10 When it is acute, the preceding diphthong, if grave, becomes acute.

This, also, is a universal usage. The commentator quotes two examples *āva rundhatē 'sathān vā'i* (vii 3 8¹ O omits *ava*) and *ānnapatē 'nnasya* (iv 2 3¹ and v 2 2¹).

स्वरितश्च सर्वत्र स्वरितश्च सर्वत्र ॥ ११ ॥

11 As also, in every case, if circumflex.

The commentator explains *ca*, 'also,' as bringing down *udātte*,

9 *yam*¹ *adhikṛtyā*² *'yam* *prabandha* *uktas*³ *tasminn*⁴ *akāre* *'nu-*
dātte *lupte* *sati* *pūrva* *ekāra* *okāro* *vo* *'dāttah*⁵ *svaritam* *āpadyate*
*yathā*⁶ *tē*---- *sō*----

¹ G M *ayam* ² G M *asm-* ³ G M put next after *pūrva* ⁴ in B only

10 *tasminn*¹ *evā*² *'kāra* *udātte*³ *lupte* *sati*⁴ *pūrva* *ekāra* *okāro* *vā*
'nudātta *udāttam* *āpadyate* *yathā*⁵ *āva*---- *anna*----

¹ O *asm* ² O puts next after *eva* ³ O om ⁴ in O only

'when the elided *a* is acute,' from the preceding rule, and *sarvatra*, 'in every case,' as signifying 'whether the circumflex be independent or enclitic.' His examples are *bheshajām gávē 'gvāya* (1 8 6¹) and *ōyō 'jāyathāh* (1 6 12⁴), where the final syllables of *gāve* and *ōyah* have the enclitic circumflex by xiv 29, and *ātho 'kthyō 'thā 'tarāti āh* (vii 1 5⁴ G M O omit the first word), where the final syllable of *ukthyāh* has the independent circumflex before the elision.

We might perhaps also fairly conclude that *sarvatra* implies an inclusion of the case treated of in rule 9, and virtually teaches that a final circumflex, eliding an initial grave, is still circumflex.

With this chapter ends the first *pragṇa*, or section, of the treatise. The division into *pragṇas* is a purely external and formal one, and (as I gave notice would be the case, in the Introductory Note to the Atharva Prātiçākhyā) is made no account of in this edition. References made to the succeeding chapters by section and chapter will easily be found by adding twelve to the number of the chapter as given.

CHAPTER XIII

CONTENTS 1-3, loss of *m*, before semivowels and spirants, 4, its retention before *rajan* etc., 5-15, details of the occurrence of *n*, otherwise than as the result of *sandhi*, 16, interchange of *d* and *l*.

अथ मकारलोपः ॥ १ ॥

1 Now for the omission of *m*

11 *udātta iti caçabdo jñāpayati tasminn¹ akāra udātte² sati saiva³ ekāra okāro vā svarita udāttam āpadyate bheshajām*
 ---- *ojo --- sarvatri⁴ 'ti vacunān nityasvarito⁵ 'pi tathāh 'va tad vidhānam syāt atho----*

iti tribhāshyaratne prātiçākhyavivarane

dvādaço 'dhyāyāh

⁶*iti prathamah pragṇah⁵*

¹ O *asm-* ² G M *ins lupte*, O *ins ca lupte* ³ O *sarvatra*, G M *sarvatra-sitha* ⁴ O *ritasya* ⁽⁵⁾ O *om*, G M *prathamapragṇas samaptah harih om çubham astu om*, W adds *l har' hi om*, and, as prelude to the next section, *priganeçaya namaḥ harih om*, B adds *harih om*.

1 *athe¹ 'ty ayam adhkārah makāralopa² ucyaṭa ity etad adhikṛtam vedātavyam³ 'ita uttaram yad vakshyāmah⁴ makārasya lopo makāralopaḥ⁵*

¹ O *rasya l-* ⁽²⁾ W B *om* ³ B *om*

A general heading, of which, however, the force extends but a very little way (through rule 4). The subject is a supplement to that treated at v 27-31, where we are told what is done with *m* before a mute, or before any other semivowel than *r*.

रेफोष्मपरः ॥ २ ॥

2 A *m* is omitted, when followed by *r* or a spirant

This omission of *m* is accompanied, according to xv 1-3, by the nasalization of the preceding vowel, or else the insertion of *anusvāra* after it. Respecting the relation of these alternative views to one another, see the note to u 30. The definition of the *m* as lost or omitted accords best with the former view. It is sufficiently logical and consistent to say that the consonant is lost and the vowel nasalized, if, however, an *anusvāra*, as a separate vocal element, is to take the place of *m* after the vowel, the only acceptable form of statement must be that the *m* is directly converted into *anusvāra*. This form of statement is in fact adopted by the Rik (iv 5) and Vāj (iv 1) Prātigākhyas, which acknowledge an *anusvāra*, while the other is rightly preferred by the Ath. Prat. (u 32, 1 67), which holds the theory of the nasalized vowel. Our own treatise, as was pointed out above (p 68), tims between the two views.

The commentator's examples are *pratyushtaṁ rakṣah* (i 1 2¹ et al), *sañcitam me brahma* (iv 1 10³ v 1 10²), *tañ shud aḥna* (v 5 2⁶), *sañ-sam id yuvase vrshan* (u 6 11⁴ iv 4 4⁴ only G M have *vrshan*), and *tvañ ha yad yavishthya* (u 6 11¹). Counter-examples are given to show that *m* before other letters is not dropped, *idam vām āsye* (u 3 11¹), to show that the dropped *m* must be a final, *tasmāt tāmra āpah* (vi 4 2⁴). The commentator, namely, has quietly introduced the limitation *padāntah*, 'when final,' into his explanation of the rule, without pointing out whence he derives it. It comes, in fact, only from the general scope of the treatise, which thus far, having the relation of *pada* and *samlutā* texts under treatment, has dealt almost exclusively with final and initial letters.

यवकारपरश्चैकेषामाचार्याणाम् ॥ ३ ॥

3. As also, according to some teachers, when followed by *y* or *v*.

2 *rephaparaṣ*¹ co² "shmaparaṣ ca padānto³ makāro lupyate yathā⁴ praty-.... sañ-.... tañ-.... sañ-.... tvañ-....
"evampara iti kim idam-.... padānta iti kim tasmāt-....
rephaṣ co "shmanāṣ⁵ ca "rephoshmanāḥ te pare⁶ yasmāt sa tathoktah.

¹ W *rephaṣ* ² O om ca ³ B nte ⁴ G M om ⁵ O om ⁶ G M O mā
(1) B G M O *rephoshmanādu tāu parāu*

The authorities here quoted are, as the commentator does not fail to point out, the same with those referred to above, in v 30, where we were taught that some teachers hold *m* not to be assimilated to a following *y* or *v*, any more than to *r*. The accepted teaching of the treatise, however, is (v 28-9) that *m* before *y*, *l*, and *v* becomes a nasal counterpart to those letters respectively whence the present rule is pronounced unapproved. For the bearings of the discordant doctrine, see note to v 30.

The examples are *tvañ yajñeshv idyah* (1 1 14⁴, 2 3^{1 2} O omits *idyah*) and *tañ vā etañ yajamānuh* (v 6 9³ O omits the last word) the ordinary and approved reading would be *tvam*, *tam*, and *etam*—as all the MSS in fact read, neglecting the illustration of the opinion set forth in the rule. A counter-example is given, *yam² kāmāyeta* (1 6 10⁴ et al)

न सस्सामिति रापरः ॥४॥

4 But not the *m* of *sam* and *sām*, when followed by *rā*

This is a precept applying only to the two words *samrāy* and *sāmṛāya*, and in the other Prāticākhyas (see note to Ath Pī 11 36) these words or the root *rāy* are particularly specified, since, however, the syllable *rā* does not chance to occur in the Tāttirīya Sanhitā except in these words after *sam* or *sām*, there is no inaccuracy in the more general statement as here made. The examples of the occurrence of the words in question selected by the commentator as illustrations are *pru samrāyam* (1 6 12³) and *sāmṛāyāya sukratuh* (1 8 16¹ O omits *sukratuh*). As counter-examples, we have *ṣaṇ rāyann oshadhībhyah* (11 2 3¹) to show that no other words

3 *yakāraparo*¹ *vakāraparo vā makāro lupyata ity ekeshām*² *matam ya evā'sya pañcamādhyāye*³ *savarṇāpattim*⁴ *pratishedhayanti*⁵ *teshām evāi 'sha lopavidhir iti tām anvādicati cakārah smhāvalokanena*⁶ *yathā tvam---- tam---- evampara iti kim yam---- yakāraṣ ca vakāraṣ ca yavakān du tū parāu yasmāt sa tathoktah*

⁷ *etat sūtram anīṣtam*

¹ G M ins *vā* ² G M O ins *ācāryānām* ³ B G M *mānuvāke* ⁴ B *savarṇam agre varṇinah*, G M *-napratip* ⁵ W B *-dham* ⁶ O *-kanmyāyena* ⁷ G M O *nāi 'tat sūtram īṣtam*

4 ¹ *re 'ty*¹ *evamparah* ² *samsām ity etayor grahanayor*² *makāro na lupyate yathā*³ *pra---- sāmṛ---- sam sām iti kim ṣaṇ---- rāpara iti kim sañrarānaḥ padāntaṣ ca vy-añjanaparah prāhṛta* (xiv 28) *iti*⁴ *vakshyamānam*⁵ *dvitva-nishedham itṣabdo*⁶ *nivṛdayati tasmād atra dvitvasiddhiḥ*⁷

(¹) the MSS, as usual in such a case, *rā ity* (²) G M put at beginning, O om *grahanayor* ³ in G M only ⁴ O om ⁵ G M *na* ⁶ G M *itṣ* ⁷ G M add *itṣabdas sam sām ity anayor eve 'ti samarthayati*

retain an unchanged *m* before *rā*, and *sañrarānaḥ* (1 4 44¹) to show that only *rā*, not *ra*, effects the retention

According to W B O, the particle *iti* in the rule is intended to deny the application to the word here had in view of rule xiv 28, respecting duplication, and to assure the duplication of the *m* before the *r*. But G M insert *tu*, 'but,' in the rule after *iti*, ascribing to it the effect just defined, and making the *iti* simply signify that the words mentioned, and no others, are the subjects of the rule. And G (not M) writes the examples accordingly, *sammrāyaṁ* and *sāmmrāyāya*. That this bit of constructive interpretation is a pure figment of the commentators does not need to be pointed out, respecting its occasion and bearing, see the note to xiv 28. I have adopted the reading of W etc., which is presumably the older and more genuine in the comment on xiv 28, even G M agree with the others in making *iti* the bond of connection between the two rules

अथ वर्णानाम् ॥ ५ ॥

5 Now of individual sounds

According to the comment on rule xiv 2 (see the note to that rule), we have here one of the main division lines of the treatise. Thus far, from the beginning of the fifth chapter, we have had to do chiefly with the combination of separate words or *padas* into connected text, now we turn to the determination of individual letters, which are read alike in both forms of text. That the intention of the treatise-makers recognized so grand a transition here may be doubted, but that the change is one of some importance is not questionable

ऋकार्कार्षपूर्वो नकारो णकारः समानपदे ॥ ६ ॥

6 Within the same word, a *n* preceded by *r*, *ṛ*, *r̥*, or *ṣh*, becomes *n*

5 *athe* 'īy ayam adhikārah varnānām samhitā vakshyate¹ ity etad adhikṛtam veditavyam ²atha vā ³athagubdah³ padasamhitānishedhakah⁴

¹ O ucyata ⁽²⁾ G M om ³ B ṣaddah ⁴ B tāyām msh

6 *samānapada ekapada rkārarkārarephashakārapūrvō¹ nakāro nakāram² āpadyate³ tribhīr----* *tvañ-----* *eshā-----* *hr-ṣhno-----* **evampūrva iti kim devānām-----* ⁴ *samānapada iti kim ebhīr-----* *samānam ca tat padam ca samānapadam tasman*

O has a *lacuna*, beginning with *-napade* at the end of the rule, and ending with *tribhīr r-* in the first example ¹ G M *rīkarareph* ² G M *natvam* ³ B G M *āpnoti* ⁽⁴⁾ O om

Already, in a previous chapter (vii 1-12, 15, 16), we have had detailed all the cases in which a *n* is changed to *n* in the course of the combination of words into phrases, in the conversion of *pada* into *samhitā*, now, the treatise sets out to account for every single *n* occurring in the whole text. And the present is the leading general rule, involving, with the extensions and restrictions imposed later, by far the greater number of cases.

The commentator's examples are *tribhir nnavā jāyate* (vi 3 10³). O has a *lacuna*, involving the beginning of this citation), *tvāñ hotrñām* (iv 3 13⁴), *esha vā rco varnah* (vi 1 3¹ but W has instead *esha vā ahno varnah*, vi 1 3^{1 2}), and *krshno 'si* (i 1 11¹), his counter-examples are *devānām vā antam jagmushām* (vii 5 8¹ but G M have only *devānām*, which of course is found in various places, and O omits altogether), where none of the lingual letters specified comes before a *n*, and *ebhir no vikāñ* (iv 4 4⁷ O omits *vikāñ*), where the *r* is in another word than the *n*. All these are cases in which the alterant letter immediately precedes the altered

व्यवेतो ऽपि ॥ ७ ॥

7 Even though other sounds are interposed

Rule 15, below, puts a restriction upon this, pointing out what letters may not intervene between the affecting and the affected letter. The examples are *aparaguvrñnam dahati* (v 1 10¹ W B omit *dahati*, O inserts *ha* between the other two words), *ātmann evā 'ramanam kurute* (vi 5 11⁴ only O has the first two words, and it omits the last), *adhishavanam* (i 1 5² but G M O have *adhishavane*, iv 7 8 01 vi 2 11⁴), and *krshamānah pratishthākāmah* (iii 4 3³)

हिरण्मयम् ॥ ८ ॥

8 Also in *hiraṇmayam*

The only passage in which the word occurs is quoted by the commentator *hiraṇmayam dāma dakṣiṇā* (ii 4 13 O omits *dakṣiṇā*). The intent of the rule is to establish in advance a counter-exception to the exception "not when followed by a muto," made in rule 15, below

7 *uktanimittapūrvō nakāro 'nyena¹ 'vyaveto 'pi² 'vyavaheto 'pi³ natvam āpnoti yathā⁴ ap---- ātmann---- adhiv---- krsh----*

¹ G M ins *varnena* ² W O om ³ G M om ⁴ in O only

8 *hiraṇmayam ity asmin grahane nakāro 'natvam āpnoti¹ yathā² hiraṇ---- sparṣapara (xiii 15) iti³ vakshyamāna-pratishedhasya⁴ pratiprasavārtham idam sūtram*

¹ G M *nakāram āpadyate* ² in B only ³ O om ⁴ O *-nasya pr-*

पाणिगणपुण्यकण्ठाणगाणब्राणवेणुगुणमणिप्रवदिषु पूर्वः ॥ १ ॥

9 Also, in the inflectional and derivative forms of *pāni*, *gana*, *punya*, *kanva*, *kāna*, *gāna*, *bāna*, *venu*, *guna*, and *man*, the first nasal is *n*

The word *pravāda* is not found elsewhere in our treatise or its commentary. From the latter's explanation and use of it we derive for it a meaning somewhat different from that which, according to Regnier (note to Rik P1 1139), it bears in the Rik Prātīkhyā. The latter makes it mean 'theme,' in our comment, on the other hand, it evidently signifies a derived form of a theme, in any gender or case, in composition, or in extension by secondary suffix, and I have translated it accordingly. So far as I can see, however, the same signification belongs to it in most of the passages of the Rik P1 also, and Regnier's exposition of its use calls for revision.

There is an abrupt change of implication here, without any intimation of it in the terms of the precept itself, it is only at the end of rule 14, below, that we find the word *prākṛtāh*, which we must understand as applying to rules 9-14—a kind of footing instead of heading (*adhikāra*) see another like case in the third chapter, rules 2-7 (note on 112). In this connected paragraph of rules we have an enumeration of the words in which a *n* is "original," and hence found equally in all the forms of the text.

The examples are *supāni svanūri* (11111⁴ 116³ O, in this and the two following examples, has only the first word), *vrshapānayo 'cāh* (1166³), and *hīranyapānam ūtaye* (1425 11212²) the text contains half a dozen other examples of the *pravādas* of *pāni*,—*gānānām tvā gaṇapatiṁ havāmahe* (11314³ O omits the last word), *gānā me mā vi trshan* (11118²), *ganena ganam* (1447⁷), and *dāreṇmitraḥ ca ganah* (11656⁶) the cases,

9 *pāni*¹ 'tyādiṣabdhānām¹ pravādeshu pūrvah prathamō nakārah prakṛtyā² 'va veditavyah prakarshena vādah³ pravādah³ līnga-vibhaktibhedasamāsataddhātādbhir⁴ nirdeṣa⁵ ity arthah yathā⁶ sup----- vrshap----- hīran----- gānānām----- gānā----- ganena----- dāre----- punyo----- sā----- kanvā----- tasyā----- akarnayā----- gānap----- viśalyo----- venu----- venunā----- yad----- yathā----- maninā----- 'nanu gānābaddhapravādatvād gānagrahanam ayuktam⁷ 'mā 'vam⁸ ganappravādatve sati tad bhavet kintu gaṇapatiḥ gānābaddhapravādo 'yam pūrvā itī kim gan----- ven----- man----- ' ityādiṣhā⁹ 'ttarasya⁹ natvam mā bhād itī

¹ G M -ānām grahanānām ² W dāh ³ W -vādah, G M om ⁴ W om
bheda ⁵ W nirdeṣhā ⁶ G M om ⁷ G M om ⁸ W vam ⁹ G M O ra
nakārasya

compounds, and derivatives of *gana* are found by dozens in the Sanhitā,—*punyo bhavati vasantam* (i 6 11⁴ O omits the last word) and *sā mā sarvān punyān* (vii 1 7¹) *punya* occurs in five other passages, once (ii 3 8⁵) in composition,—*kanvā abhi prā gāyata* (iv 3 13⁷ O ends with *abhi*) there are two other cases of declensional forms,—*tasyān kāno yā datah* (ii 5 1⁷ O alone has the last word, and it omits the first, G M end with *kānah*) and *akarnayā 'kānayā 'glonayā* (vi 1 6⁷ only W has the last word) there is no other case,—*gānapatyān mayobhār e 'hi* (iv 1 2² O has only the first word, only G M have the last two) I have noted but one other case,—*viśalyo bānavān uta* (iv 5 1⁴ O omits the first word) we have a declensional case of *bāna* at iv 6 4⁵,—*venur vānavi bhavati* (v 1 1⁴ O omits the last word), *venunā vi mimite* (v 2 5²), and *yad venoh sushiram* (v 1 1⁴) there are a couple more of cases,—*yathā gune gunam* (vii 2 4²) we have elsewhere only *dviguna*, at v 2 5^{2,3},—and *maninā rūpāni* (vii 3 14) elsewhere only *manvāla*, at v 6 13 To explain the limitation *pānvah*, 'the first nasal,' in the rule, the commentator quotes parts of passages already given—namely *ganānām tvā*, *venunā vi*, and *maninā rūpāni* (but O omits the second example, and the second word of the third)—in which the *pravādas* exhibit a second nasal which is dental He raises the objection, moreover, that the mention of *gāna* in the rule is unnecessary, since the word is a *pravāda* of *gana*, but replies that the word (*gānapatyā*) aimed at is a *pravāda* of *ganapati*, not of *gana* It is true, now, that *gānapatyāt* stands one degree farther removed from *gana* than does, for instance, *ganapatiḥ*, or than would *gānikah* if it occurred in the text, yet we should hardly have expected it on that account to receive a different treatment

पणिपणिंवीयमाणऊण्योः ॥ १० ॥

10 Also in *pani*, *panim*, *vīyamānah*, and *ūnyoh*

The passages are *agne deva panibhur vīyamānah* (i 1 13² only G M have the last word), *panim gosku stavāmahe* (ii 6 11² O omits the last word), *vīyamānah tam ta etam* (i 1 13² O has only the first word, G M read *-nas tam* etc, neglecting the pause of division between the two words), and *ūnyoh kavikratuni* (i 2 6¹) These words are said to be made a separate rule of because there is no longer any inclusion of *pravādas* or derived forms

उवर्गपरः ॥ ११ ॥

11 Also before a lingual mute

10 ¹ *pani* 'tyādīgrahaneṣhu² nakārah prakṛtyāi 'va veditavyaḥ
xpravādartho 'yam ārambhah agne---- panim---- vīy-----
ūnyoh----

¹ O prefixes the whole series of words ² O -ādīshu, G M -ādīshu gr.

The examples are *gṛīkanthāya ca* (iv 5 5¹ but G M have instead *gṛīkanthāya svāhā*, which I do not find in the text, not even at vi 3 17, where a number of similar expressions are read) and *kaṇḍūyeta pāmanambhāvukāh* (vi 1 3⁸ O has the first word only) The combinations *nt* and *ndh* do not occur in the Sanhitā

चङ्कुणफणत्स्यूणीह्णिणुयाद्विणोतिकौणयोऽणिष्ठाउल्ब-
णमुगणाश्रुतिश्रुपुणीकाबाणिजायाणवश्चाट्णारस्थाणुंतू-
णवेवीणायामझाणयापणेत्वाणीःकल्याणीकुणपंवाण-
शतशाणाश्रुतिर्धाणिकामेणी ॥ १२ ॥

12 Also in *caṅkuna*, *phanat*, *sthūnāu*, *hinuyāt*, *hinoti*, *kāu-neyah*, *anishthāh*, *ulbanam*, *uganā* wherever found, *cupunīkā*, *bānyāya*, *anavaṣ ca*, *ānārah*, *sthānum*, *tūnave*, *vīnāyām*, *alo-nayā*, *paneta*, *vānīh*, *kalyānī*, *kunapam*, *vānah* *ṣata*, *ṣonā* wher ever found, *dhānukā*, and *m enī*

The passages aimed at are quoted by the commentator as follows *avabhrtha nicanīkuna nīceruh* (1 4 45² all but O omit *nīceruh*, which would allow the passage to be found also at vi 6 3⁴, O omits *avabhrtha*) *nicanīkuna* occurs a second time in 1 4 45², *anvāpanīphanat* (1 7 8³), *ayāsthāndv uditāu* (1 8 12³), *bhrā-trvyāya pra hinuyāt* (11 2 6⁵ O begins with *pra*), *evā 'smāi pra hinoti* (11 2 6⁵), *rajanō vāi kāuneyah* (11 3 8¹), *ye 'nshthās tān* (11 5 5²), *yajña ulbanam kīyute* (11 4 3⁷), and also, by 1 53, *anulba-nam* (at 11 4 3⁶), *āvyaḍhinīr uganā uta* (iv 1 10² the example is wanting in W) and *uganābhyas trīḥatībhyah* (iv 5 4¹ O omits the last word), *varshayanti cupunīkā nāmā 'sī* (iv 4 5¹ only W has the first word, and it omits the last), *mantrine bānyāya kakshānān patuyē* (iv 5 2² B G M omit the first word, G

11 ¹*tavarge pare*¹ *nakārah*² *prakṛtyāi 'va veditavyah* *gṛī-*
---- *kaṇḍ-*---- *tavangah paro yasmāt sa tathoktāh*

(¹) B G M *igaparah*, O *igaparo va* (²) G M put after *'va*

12 *caṅkuna*----- *eshu nakārah prakṛtyāi 'va veditavyah*
avabh----- *anv-*---- *aya-*---- *bhīāt-*---- *evā-*---- *ra-*
jano --- *ye-*---- *yajña-*---- *yatrāyatra gruter uganāgraha-*
*nasya*¹ *tatratatra natvam karanīyam* ²*āvya-*---- ³*ugan-*----
narsh----- *mantrine-*---- *prīy-*---- *ce 'ti kim anavas*
---- *etam-*---- *ya-*---- *yā-*---- *aṣṭonayā-*---- *pane-*----
indrām----- *kalyānī-*---- *purushak-*---- *vānīh-*---- *ṣate*
'ti kim ³*rtāv-*---- ³*ṣonā-*---- *'gruter iti kim* *ṣonāya-*---- ⁴
ni----- *vanas-*---- *makāreṇa kim ubhāy-*----

¹ G M O put before *yatra-* (²) W om (³) O om (⁴) O om

M the last, W O the last two), *pryamgavaṣ ca me 'navaṣ ca me* (iv 7 4² G M omit the first word, O the first three), with a counter example, *anavaṣ te ratham* (i 6 12⁶), to prove the need of *ca* in the citation, *etam vār para ātndrah* (v 6 5³), *ya sthānuṁ hantrī* (vii 3 1¹) we have *yagnāsthānu* twice at vi 1 2⁴, *yā tānave yā vīndāyām* (vi 1 4¹), *aṣṭonayā 'saptaṣaphayā kīnātrī* (vi 1 6⁷ only O has *krinātrī*), *panetā 'goarghamī* (vi 1 10¹), *indram vānir anāshatū* (i 6 12²), *kalyānī rūpasumrddhā sā syāt* (vii 1 6⁶ only O has the last two words) *kalyānī* occurs in one or two other passages *puuushakunapam aṣvakunapam gāuh* (vii 2 10² only O has *gāuh*) we have *kunapam* as independent word at vii 2 10², *vānah gatatantur bhavati* (vii 5 9²), with a counter example, to show the necessity of adding *gata* in the rule, *rāvānaṣ caya-mānā rndmī* (ii 1 11⁵ only G M have *rnānī*, O omits the example *vānah* is a *pada* in the word as divided, *rta-vānuh*), *gonā dhrshnū nrvāhasā* (vii 4 20 W B end with *dhrshnū*) and *gonāya svāhā* (vii 3 18 O omits the example, along with the specification of the point it illustrates), the only examples of *gonā* that the text contains, *nī jalgulītrī dhānikā* (vii 4 19³), and *vanaspatīndm enī* (v 5 15 O reads *enya*), with a counter-example, to show that the word only occurs after a *m*, *ubhayata enī syāt tad dhuḥ* (vii 1 6⁵ G M O end with *syāt*)

अवग्रहो वृषणहीर्षणब्रह्मसन्नापचर्मपचर्षण् ॥ १३ ॥

* 13 As final of the former member of a compound, *n* is found in *vrshan*, *gīrshan*, *brahman*, *akshan*, *carman*, and *carshan*

The term *avagraha*, we are told, is here taken in the sense of *avagrahasṭha*. The same interpretation has been given before (under vi 9), and the whole use of *avagraha* in the treatise verges toward an equivalence with its derivative. Only T O change the *g* of *gīrshan* to *ch* after *n*, but, as this is in accordance with the teaching of the Prātiśākhya (v 34), I have adopted it.

The examples quoted by the commentator are *vāto apām vrshanvān* (ii 1 11¹ O omits *vāto*), *gīrshanvān nedhyo bhavati* (vii 5 25¹), *brahmanvanto devā āsan* (vi 4 10¹ W B omit *āsan*), *akshanvate svāhā* (vii 5 12¹), and *carmanvate svāhā* (vii 5 12²). We have *vrshan-* also at ii 5 8⁴ iv 1 2¹ vii 5 5¹, *gīrshan-* at vii 5 12¹, and *brahman-* at v 7 8³ and vi 4 10¹ (a second time). As counter-examples, to show that the *n* occurs in these words only before a

13 *vrshan* ityādīgrahaneshv¹ *avagraho nakātrah prakṛtyā* 'va veditavyah *vāto*---- *gīrsh*---- *brahm*---- *aksh*----
²*car*m----³*car*shangrahanasya⁴ *pākhāntare* 'vyñneyam *udāharanam*⁵ *mitrusya*---- *iti* *lecā* *udāharanti*⁶ *tan na sādhu. anto* 'lopād (xiii 15) *iti* *vaikshyamānapratishedhapratiprasavīrtham* *uktatvād* *eshām* *grahanānām* *carshanādhṛta* *ity* *atra*⁷ *nakā-rasya* *padāntatvābhāvāt* *athavā* *rkārara* *āra* *aśhā*⁸ (xiii 6)

The commentary, after pronouncing the citations of the rule "parts of words, intended to include a number of cases," quotes examples, as follows *svayamātrnnām upa* (v 2 8¹, 3 2¹, 7⁴, 5 4³ O omits *upa*), *asamtrnne hi hanā* (vi 2 11³ O omits *hanā*), and *svayamātrnnā jyotiḥ* (v 7 6²) I have noted *nn* elsewhere only in *anāchrnnam* (v 1 7⁴), *abhishanno yasmāt* (ii 4 2³), *nishannāya svāhā* (vii 1 19¹ only G M have this example), and *daçamāśā nishannā āsan* (vii 5 1¹, 2¹ O omits the first word), *pāshno rañhyāi* (i 3 10²), *pāshnā sayyā saha* (iv 1 2² and v 1 2⁴ only G M have *saha*), and *pāshne prapathyāya svāhā* (vii 3 15 G M O omit *svāhā*) I have noted further only *pāushma* (i 8 9² et al), *aryanne carum nn vapet* (ii 3 4¹ twice,² G M O stop at *carum*) I find besides *sutrānne* (i 8 9² et al) and *nrnna* (i 7 13²), which last, however, the rule was not specially intended for, finally, *dadhikrāvo akārisham* (i 5 11⁴ and vii 4 19⁴ O omits *akārisham*) and *ā grāvnah* (vi 3 2³ O omits this example) further cases of *dadhikrāvan* and *grāvan* are met with in the text showing the combination *vn*, I have noted no other words in which it occurs. Counter-examples, showing that *vn* follows *rā* only, would have been easy to furnish thus, *āyasposhadāvne*, at i 2 10¹

Cases of quite various and discordant nature are here thrown together. Most unequivocally calling for treatment in the Pratiçākhyā, in order to determine their reading, are the three passages in which *sanna* is altered to *shanna* after *abhi* and *ni*, since (as quoted by the commentator below) the *padā*-text restores the original form of the word, reading *abhishanna ity abhi-sannah* etc. Its *s* is converted to *sh* according to vi 2, but there is no authority excepting here for the change of *nn* to *nn*, chapter vii does not deal with this, because it takes up only those cases in which the alterant cause and the altered nasal are found in different *padas*, and rule 6 of the present chapter does not apply to it because its first *n* is protected (according to xiii 15) by being "followed by a mute," and its second *n* by "having a lingual mute interposed." The case of *trnna* is akin with this, only with the important difference that the alteration of its nasals lies beyond the ken of the Pratiçākhyā, the *nn* being read in every text. The remaining three all fall under rule 6 of this chapter, but they require specification because they are also covered by one of the exceptions in rule 16, for they exhibit, as compared with their

14 *atra¹ sūtre padāikadeçā ete² bahūpādānārtham uktāḥ rñā-
dīshv eshu³ ca⁴ nakārāḥ prākṛtā eva vyññeyāḥ svay-.... a-sam-
.... svay-.... abhi-sh-.... 'ni-sh-....⁵ da-çā-.... pā-
sh-no-.... pāshnā-.... pāshne-.... a-ryamne-.... dadhi-
.... ā-....*

*prākṛtaçabdo 'yam pānyādīshv eva carshamparyanteshu nu-
khyāḥ catasrshu samhitāsu natvasadbhāvāt⁶ rñne⁷ 'ty ādīshv
tu⁸ na mukhyāḥ kintu pṛāptyabhāve⁹ 'p¹⁰ natvaprapunārthah
tathā hi rñnādāu pūrvanākārasyu¹⁰ span çaparavān nishedhah :*

themes (*aryaman*, *-krāvan*, *grāvan*), a “loss of *a*” (*alopa*) compare what is said of this *alopa* below

As regards the application of the term *prākṛta*, ‘original,’ then discordance is more essential, and, indeed, irreconcilable. In *trna*, to be sure, the cerebral *n*’s are as original as in the words specified by rule 13, since, in all alike, the alteration is an accomplished fact in all the forms of text, although ultimately referable to the cause laid down in rule 6. But the last three cases, although also read alike in all texts, are introduced here as counter exceptions to rule 15, and then *n* is no more original than is that of any other of the words falling under rule 6. And finally, there is no sense whatever in which the lingual nasals of *-shanna* are “original.” To call them all original, then, seems even more than a looseness or inaccuracy in the use of that term—it is a blunder.

The commentator perceives the difficulty, and attempts to remove it by a lengthy passage of special pleading. The term *prākṛta*, he says, is *mukhya*, ‘of primary value’ or ‘of full force,’ as applied to the words beginning with *pān* (rule 9) and ending with *carshan* (rule 13), since in them the lingualized nasal is found in all the four *samhitās*, but in *rnn* and the rest it is not *mukhya*, but is simply intended to authorize the nasalization even in the absence of a rule prescribing it. Thus, namely in *rnn* etc. (i.e. in *rnn* and *shann*), the first nasal constitutes an exception (under rule 6) as being followed by a mute (rule 15), the other nasal, as having a *t*-mute between it and the altering cause (rule 15). In *shn* and *mn*, again [why not in *rāvn*?], the nasal falls under the exception touching the loss of *a* (rule 15). And if it be objected that the lingualization is assured by the competency of the citation—still [it is answered], the implication is avoided that the occasion of the citation is the originality of the *n* [?]. Moreover, the word *ca*, ‘also,’ in the rule, being used in the sense of subsidiary adjunction (*anvācayā*), shows the lingualization to be not of primary value, if it were primary, it would be found in all the four kinds of text, but it is not so found, for we read in *pada*-text *abhishanna ity abhi-sannah* and *nishannāye ’ti ni-sannāya*. And since, from the words *pāshan* and *aryaman*, which end in *n*, such forms as *pāshno rañhyāi* and *aryamne carum* are read in the *varna*-text, therefore the conversion into *n* (all but *O* say “non-conversion into *n*”) in

¹¹*itānasyo ’ttamasya*¹¹ *tavargīyavyavahatāt*¹² *śhamnagraha-*
*nayos tv alopād iti nishedhah grahanasāmāthyād eva*¹³ *natvam*
*sādhyati ’ti cet evam svabhāvatvam eva grahanasyā ’pa*¹⁴ *mālam*
*iti parihārah kim ca anvācaye*¹⁵ *vartamānaḥ cakāro ’py eteshu*
*natvam amukhyam*¹⁶ *iti dyotayati mukhyam*¹⁷ *cet cutasrshu*
*samhitāsu vidyeta*¹⁸ *na cā ’tra vidyate tathā hi abhishanna*
*ity abhi-sannah nishannāye ’ti ni-sannāya ity atra*¹⁹
padasamhitāyām pāshann aryamann iti nakāntagabda-
yoh pāshno rañhyāi aryamne carum ity ādi siddhārā-
*patvād*²⁰ *atra varnasamhitāyām etatsāhacaryād ekasūti asthuyor*²¹

Under the first part of the rule, the passages aimed at are quoted as follows *sushunnah sūryaraçmih* (iii 4 7¹), *indrāgnibhyām tvā sayujā* (iv 4 5¹ G M omit *sayujā*, the *pada*-reading is doubtless *indrāgni-bhyām*, so that the *r* and *n* are *saṁānapade*, as required by rule 6), and *yushmānīto abhayam jyotiḥ* (ii 1 11⁶ only *ō* has *jyotiḥ*, from its inclusion here, the word must remain undivided in *pada*-text, though in that of the R̥g-Veda [ii 27 11] it is read *yushmā-nītaḥ*)

Examples of final *n* not lingualized are *pitṛn havishe attave* (ii 6 12¹) and *pra mrnīhi çatrān* (i 2 14²)

The precept touching the omission of an *a* has reference, so far as I can discover, only to the oblique cases of *vrtrahan*, of which two (and I have failed to note any others) are cited, namely *vrtraghna indrāya tvā* (i 4 1¹ *ō* omits the example) and *vrtraghna stomāḥ* (iv 7 15¹)—for the derivative adjective *vātriaghna* (ii 5 2⁵ et al.) can hardly be aimed at, and yet, the authority of this rule is needed to establish the dental *n* in this word also, which would otherwise fall under rule xiii 6. The mode of definition of the cases here intended is in very remarkable contrast with the usage elsewhere of the treatise, which, as has been repeatedly pointed out, differs from the other Prātiçākhyas especially in avoiding all reference to grammatical categories, forms, and derivations, and defining the words to which its rules relate simply by external circumstances of position and surroundings in the text. And this departure from its custom is a quite unfortunate and ill-judged one for, in the first place, it renders necessary a part of the specifications of the preceding rule (namely *shn*, *mn*, and *āvn*), which really lie outside the province of the treatise, and have no good reason to be mentioned, and, in the second place, as the commentator points out, it involves an inconsistency with the general subject of the chapter, which has to do with conversions arising *saṁānapade*, 'within the limits of the same *pada*,' while in *vrtra-ghnaḥ* etc the affecting cause is in one *pada* and the nasal to be affected in another. The commentator explains that the intent is, by a far-reaching glance backward (literally, 'a lion's look'), to lay down a further example to a rule in the seventh chapter, where the restriction *saṁānapade* is not in force *ghnaḥ* etc., namely, are altered forms of *han*, whose

15 *shunnah*¹ *agnih*² *yushmānītaḥ eteshu*³ *nakāro natvam nā* "padyate *sush*---- *indrā*-- *yushm*---- *antah*⁴ *padānto nakāro natvam nā* "padyate *pitṛn*---- *pra*---- *alopād*⁵ *akāruḥlopāt*⁶ *paro* "pi *nakāro natvam nā* "padyate "vrtra---⁷ *vrtra*---- *nanv atra nimittanimittor bhinnapadasthatvād* *vishamo drśhtāntah satyam* *sinhāvalokananyāyena*⁸ *prathamapracne*⁹ *saptamādhyāye*⁹ *çeshodāharanarūpena*¹⁰ *ghatate tatra ca saṁānapadanīyam*¹¹ *nā* 'sti, *ghna ity asya haṇçabdarv-krtutvā*¹² *rashahpūrvō havanī*¹³ (vii 11) 'ti *prāptih* ¹⁴ *sparçaparo nakāruç ca*¹⁵ *natvam nā* "pnoti¹⁶ *saṁkr*---- *ava*----

nasal, by vii 11, is liable to lingualization. But *han*, by the usage of the treatise, signifies 'the syllable or audible complex of sounds *han*,' not 'the theme *han* and its derivatives,' and, as the text contains no example of the combination *ghn*, it would have been easy to exempt *n* from lingualization *ghakārāt*, 'after *gh*'

The cited examples of *n* remaining unchanged when followed by a mute are *samkrandano 'nimishah* (iv 6 4¹ O has the first word only), *ava rundhe tārpyam* (ii 4 11⁶ O omits the last word), and *nakhanirbhinnam* (i 8 9¹)

The commentator then proceeds to enter into a long discussion of more than usual subtlety and obscurity, of which I am by no means confident that I apprehend the meaning. The point aimed at, indeed, seems quite clear by xiv 4, the *n* of such a word as *pūrṇa* is to be doubled, making *pārṇna*, here, then, is a case where the first *n* is "followed by a mute" (*sparṣaparah*), and so would seem to have its lingual character forbidden by the present rule. The reasonable reply to so hair-splitting and impertinent an objection would appear to be that, a duplication being ordered by the treatise, the product can be nothing but *nn*, since *nn* would be no duplication at all. The commentator, however, prefers to get around the difficulty by limiting the word *sparṣa*, 'mute,' as here used, to one which is not the product of express prescription (?). For in *pūrṇa paścāt* (iii 5 1¹ et al.) there is duplication, making *pārṇnā* (not one of the MSS writes the duplication), the one *n* being prescribed by xiv 4, the other being its occasion or root (*mūla*). With this, O prudently ends, the other MSS go on to explain "express" (? *prasiddha*) by referring to the word *nakhanirbhinnam*, already quoted above, as, with its like, also exhibiting an instance of occasion of prescription. This word, namely, falls under rules xiv 4,5 (becoming thereby *nakhanirbhinnna*), and in rule 5 the term "succeeded by a consonant" (*vyāñjanottara*) is used in a different sense from "followed by a consonant" (*vyāñjanapara*), the meaning of which will be there explained at full length (as we shall find to our cost, in one of the obscurest discussions of the entire treatise). The appositeness of the whole reference I do not understand.

Finally, examples are quoted of the suspension of nasalization by

nakha---- *sparṣo 'tā' prasiddhalakshanavishayo*¹⁸ *vivakshyate*¹⁹ *anyathā*²⁰ *pūrṇa paścāt ity ādāu natvam na syāt rephāt param ca* (xiv 4) *iti hi prasiddham*²¹ *lakshanam tannūlam ca*²² *pūrṇne 'ty ādāu dvitvam* ²³*prasiddhapadena kim* ²⁴*nakhanirbhinnam ity ādāu api katham cā*²⁵ *lakshanam ālatvam sambhavati kim tal lakshanam iti cet dvitīyacetutthayor* (xiv 5) *ity ātra sūtroktavyāñjanottarayor* ⁶ (xiv 5) *iti vāco yuktyantaram iti brūmah tasya lakshanam tūtrā 'va sphurīkarishyate*²⁷ *mahatā prabandhena*²⁸ *spurṣah paro*²⁹ *yasmād ādāu sparṣaparah* ³⁰ *śasacatatavargīyeshu* ³¹ *vyavadhāyikeshu*³¹

an intervening *ç* or *s*, or a palatal, lingual, or dental mute namely *raçanām ā datte* (vi 3 6³), *agne rasena tejasā* (i 4 46² only G M have *tejasā*), *rocante rocanā divi* (vii 4 20 O omits *rocante*), *somañ rāçnam* (i 7 10¹ et al), *prakrīdānāḥ payodhāḥ* (iv 3 13⁷), *prtānā jayānā* (iii 5 3^{1,2}), and *janaprathandāya svāhā* (iii 2 8¹ only O has *svāhā*, G M have the false reading *-pradhā-*, and O has dropped out a part of the word, giving *janandya*)

In the note to Ath Pī iii 94, I have pointed out the physical reason why these sounds, by their interposition, prevent the lingualization of the nasal they are, all of them, such as call into action for their utterance the tip of the tongue, throwing it out of adjustment for the lingual contact. The tendency which the history of Aryan language in India exhibits toward the conversion of dentals into linguals shows itself most actively in the case of the nasal the tongue, being rolled back into the position of lingual articulation by the utterance of *r*, *ṛ*, *ṛ*, or *sh*, hangs suspended there, as it were, and makes the next nasal contact lingual, unless the tendency is satisfied by the intermediate production of such a contact, or frustrated by the transfer elsewhere of the articulating organ.

The Prāticākhyā's enumeration of the cases of occurrence of the lingual nasal is, so far as I have been able to determine, complete. No one of the other treatises undertakes such an enumeration.

पृक्तस्वरात्परो लो उं पौष्करसादिः पौष्करसादिः ॥१६॥

16 In the opinion of Pāuṣkaraśādi, *l* after a mixed vowel becomes *d*.

The mention of Pāuṣkaraśādi (O has everywhere Pauskarasādi), the commentator says, is out of respect, and not because the rule is not a peremptory one. "Mixed vowel" is a term which is not elsewhere employed by the treatise, nor does the latter contain anything that should intimate an explanation of its meaning. The comment glosses it by 'the sound *r*' it appears, then, that *r* is thus styled, from having its vocalic quality 'mixed' with consonantal, namely, with the *r*-sound. The other Prāticākhyas (see

satsu nakūro natvam nā "padhyate yathā" *raçanām*----
agne---- *rocante*---- *somañ* --- *prakrī*---- *prtānā*
---- *jana*---- *rkārurkārā* (iii 5) "*diprāpteh*" *pratiśhedho*³⁴
'yam vihatih

¹ W B O *sumnah*, G M *sushumnah* ² W O *agni* ³ O *eshu*, G M *eshu*
grahaneshu ⁴ W B *latah* ⁵ W B O om ⁽⁶⁾ O om ⁷ G M *-kanena* ⁸ O om
⁹ G M *yāya* ¹⁰ W O *vṛesh-* ¹¹ G M O *datvam-* ¹² G M *-bdādihā-*
⁽¹³⁾ G M *drśhtāḥ purvo bhavati* ¹⁴ G M ins *sparçaparāḥ* ¹⁵ G M om ¹⁶ G
M "*padhyate*" ¹⁷ B G M *tra* ¹⁸ B *vṛeshayor* ¹⁹ O *vikshyate*, G M *pi vā yu-*
yate ²⁰ W B *yātha*, G M *āthā 'pi* ²¹ O *-dāha*, W *prātsiddha* ²² W *ce 'th*,
O om ²³ O om ²⁴ W B O ins *ca* ²⁵ W O *etal* ²⁶ B *sutray*, G M *su-*
tre vy ²⁷ G M *spāshituk-* ²⁸ W *purvo* ²⁹ G M ins *vyavayishu* ³⁰ B ins *vy*
avayeshu ³¹ G M O om ³² in W only ³³ G M *-th* ³⁴ W O *pratinish-*

sion') of the rule founded on the authority of the grammarians, who assert a homogeneousness of the *duhghishta l* and of the *d*, as being both produced in the lingual position and if the question is raised as to how it is so founded, reference is made to a rule of Pāṇini (1.1.50), which prescribes that, in case of substitution, the most nearly related letter is to be taken. I do not see that this exposition and reference have any pertinence whatever.

Then, the commentator adds yet another interpretation, which, he remarks, is also highly esteemed. It differs from the one already given only in implying (apparently, from xiii 6) *samānapade*, 'within the limits of a single *pada*,' taking, then, a different example, *te no mrdayantū* (iv 4.3² et al.), with the counter-example *ulāmāṃ bhavati* (vi 5.9¹)—which, in view of the frequent occurrence in the Sanhitā of *idā*, *idāvanti*, and their like, is not much to the point—and finally, as further counter-example, to justify the restriction *samānapade*, the phrase *pitṛlokañ somena* (ii 6.2¹, p. *pitṛ-lokaṃ*), where the *l* does not become *d* after *r*. But in this last case is involved an additional difficulty, namely, that in the compound *pitṛlokakāmasya* (vi 6.4¹, p. *pitṛloka-kāmasya*) the *r* and *l* do meet *samānapade*, and yet the *l* maintains itself over this, the commentator hobbles as best he may, with the plea that, prohibition having been made in the case of *pitṛloka*, it is extended by association to the further compound.

The groundlessness and unintelligence of all this special pleading, resorted to for the purpose of forcing in as an integral part of the Prātiśākhya a precept altogether foreign to it, is palpable enough, and one grudges the time and words spent in its exposure.

vanād rkhārāt² paṇo lakāṇo dakāraṃ āpadyate yathā²³ te----
prkṭasvarād iti kim ulām----- samānapada iti kim pitṛl-
----- saha-caritvād⁴ ekasya²⁵ nishuddha²⁶ itarasyā²⁷ pi pitṛloka-
kāmasye²⁷ 'ty asyā²⁸ 'pi⁸ samānapadatve sūty api nishedho bha-
vati idam api pāthāntaram bahvādrtam

iti tribhāshyaratne prātiśākhyavivarane
trayodaśo²⁹ 'dhyāyah

¹ W B om ² B om, G M lo dam ³ all but B *duyl*, B *gnako*, O *gñō*, G M *gnakam* ⁴ O everywhere *pauska* ⁵ W *tena*, B *tam* ⁶ B *vad* 'B *iti* ⁷ *ta* ⁸ G M O *-di* ⁹ W om ¹⁰ all but B *duyl* W B *shtadalak*, O *lakara-*
duk, G M *talakar-* ¹¹ O *sadr̥ṣasanyāṇō dukarum* ¹² W *-sarat*, G M *sara*
¹³ G M *uryate* ¹⁴ G M ins *varnamam* ¹⁵ G M O *mas sadṛṣatama* ¹⁶ W
asya, O *sutra* ¹⁷ B *iti* ¹⁸ B ins *iti* ¹⁹ O *sāda ity*, G M *ity* only ²⁰ G M
-dasya, and om *ity asya* ²¹ G M ins *pakṣhe* ²² W om ²³ O om ²⁴ W B O
-caritv ²⁵ O *-smṛin* ²⁶ B *nishedha* ²⁷ W B *kasye*, G M *lokamasye* ²⁸ G
M O om *api* ²⁹ G M O *dvitīye prāṇe prathamō*

CHAPTER XIV

CONTENTS 1-7, duplication of one of the members of a group of consonants, 8, duplication of *ch*, *kh*, and *bh*, in certain cases 9-11, insertion between a surd spirant and mute, 12-13, aspiration of a surd mute before a spirant, 14-28, exceptions to the rules for duplication, and discordant views of certain authorities respecting them, 29-33, occurrence of the enclitic circumflex

स्वरपूर्व व्यञ्जनं द्विवर्णं व्यञ्जनपरम् ॥१॥

1 A consonant preceded by a vowel is doubled, if followed by a consonant

The intricate and obscure subject of duplication in consonant-groups is treated at more length in this than in the other Prāticākhyas (compare R Pr vi 1-3, V Pr iv 97-114, A Pr iii 26-32, also Pāṇini viii 4 46-52), but chiefly on account of the liberal citation here made of the discordant views of various teachers respecting it. The doctrines of the treatise itself are mainly in accordance with those of the rest. This first and leading principle, that the first consonant of a group is doubled, is stated in equivalent terms by all. The principal restrictions to its application are, as stated below, that *r*, *h*, *z*, *φ* (rule 15), and a letter doubled, or a mute followed by another of the same series (rule 23), are exempted from duplication. For the details, see the following rules.

Of course, in applying the rules for duplication, we have to assume the form of the consonant-groups as determined by the other precepts of the Prāticākhya—treating *visarjaniya*, for example, as is prescribed in the ninth chapter, and making the insertions pointed out in the fifth (v 32, 33 etc.). And further, to finish the matter, the rules for *yama*, *nāsikya*, and *svarabhakti* (xxi 12-16) must be duly taken into account.

In an additional note to the Atharva Prāticākhya, I gave a complete list of the consonant-groups of the Atharva-Saṁhitā, with the forms which they come finally to assume under the laws of combination. It has been necessary to prepare a similar one for the Tāttirīya-Saṁhitā, in testing the reach and bearing of the rules of the present treatise—but the scheme is hardly worth giving in full.

1 svarapūrvam vyañjanam¹ vyañjanaparam² dvivarnam āpad-
yate yathā³ uru---- evampūrva iti kim tat---- evampara
iti kim uru---- vyañjanam iti kim pa---- svarah pārvo
yasmāt⁴ tat⁵ svarapūrvam vyañjanam asmāt param iti vyañja-
naparam dvayor vānayoḥ samāhdro dvivarnam⁶

¹ G M put next before dvivarnam ² O param ³ G M om ⁴ W ins asāu
⁵ B om ⁶ O adds svarapūrvam iti kim prajānanam padbhyaṁ---- vy-
ājanaparam iti kim uganā uta vyañjana iti kim prāgan

The commentator offers a single example, *uru prathasva*,¹ e *uru pprathasva* (1 18 et al. the MSS of the comment only very rarely and irregularly write the groups in their duplicated form, so as to illustrate the rules of the chapter), and adds counter-examples first, to show that the consonant is liable to duplication only after a vowel, *tat pravāte* (vi 4 7² hardly a well-chosen example, since, though the *p* of *pra* is this time unchanged, the *t* before it must be doubled, *tatt pr-*, a *pra* after a pause would have answered better), second, that the duplication takes place only before a consonant, *urukrd uru nah* (11 6 11³), third, that only a consonant, not a vowel, in the defined position, is duplicated, *praugam uktham* (iv 4 2¹) O appends a new set of counter-examples, as if a part of a new exposition, namely *prayananam* (15 9¹), *padbhyām dve savane* (vi 1 6⁴ an ill-chosen example, containing cases of duplication as well as of its omission), and *ugandā uta* (iv 1 10²)

लवकारपूर्व स्पर्शश्च पौष्करसादेः ॥ २ ॥

2 Likewise, according to Pāuṣhkarasādhī, a mute preceded by *l* or *v*

The commentator declares that the *ca*, 'likewise,' in this rule brings down from the one preceding the being preceded by a vowel, and duplication. The former part of the defined implication is at least otiose, since *l* and *v* never occur in the Saṁhitā before a mute, except as themselves preceded by a vowel. *v*, indeed, is found in combination only with the nasal mutes, *n* and *ṇ*, *l*, in the groups *lh*, *lg*, *lp*, *lb*, *lbh*, *lm*, and *lpy*. The examples quoted are *kālpān nihoti* (v 4 8⁵) and *vibhūddāṇe* (11 5 8^{1,9}² all save B actually read this time *-dāṇne*, with doubled *n*). According to the interpretation given to the next rule, the worthy Pāuṣhkarasādhī does not regard the duplication of the mute after the semivowel as suspending the duplication of its predecessor also, by rule 1, and he would accordingly read *kālpān* and *-dāṇne*, and this part of his doctrine is, as we shall see, declared unapproved.

Counter-examples are given *kalyāṇī rūpasamrddhā* (vii 1 6⁶ to be pronounced *kālyāṇī*, or, by rule 21, *kalyāṇī*) and *vāyavyam* (18 7¹ et al. to be made *vāyavyam*), to show that no other letter than a mute is thus doubled, and *kāṣmāñ chakubhih* (v 7 23) and *tasmād etat* (vi 3 11⁶), instancing other consonants than *l* and *v*, with the following mute not doubled in these words, the sibilant

2 *pāuṣhkarasādhī*¹ *mate lakṣaṇapūrvā*² *vākārapūrvā vā sparṣa*³
*dvivarnam āpadyate*⁴ *kālpān* -- *vibh-*---- *svaṇapūrvā-*
*tvam dvivarnam cā 'nvādhātī cakārah*⁴ *'sparṣa' itī kim kaly-*
---- *vāy-*---- *evampūrvā itī kim kāṣ-*---- *tasm-*----⁵ *lakṣ-*
*raṣ ca vākāraṣ ca lakṣārāṇi*⁷ *tāu pūrvāu yasmāt sa tathoktaḥ*

¹ O *paushkar*, as also in the rule ² B G M ins *vā* ⁽³⁾ O *dvivarnam āpadyate*
⁴ G M put at beginning of clause ⁽⁴⁾ O om ⁵ G M *sparṣapāna* ⁷ W O
lakṣa avah-

is itself doubled (except by Hāiṭa, rule 18), a first mute of the same series with the nasal is inserted before the latter (rule 9), and between the two mutes a *yama* (xxi 12), so that we have as final result the formidable combinations *ccppm* and *ssppm*

The Rik Pī (vi 2) also requires a double mute after *l*, and the Vāṅ Pr (iv 99) after any semivowel—which last is equivalent with our rule, since *ṛ* is never followed by a mute

We have a right to be surprised at the introduction of this and the rule next following before rule 4, since the duplication they teach is analogous to that after *r*, and of secondary importance to it

स्पर्श एवैकेषामाचार्याणाम् ॥ ३ ॥

3 According to some teachers, the mute only

That is to say, in the combinations just treated of, the mute is duplicated, but not the preceding semivowel also, and we are to read *kalppān* and *vibhādānne*

According to the commentator, this rule represents the approved usage in the *śākhā*. It seems very strange to find such approved usage laid down in the *Pratīcākhya* merely as the *dictum* of certain authorities. But a rule (xiv 7) is given below, without any restriction, which plainly implies the validity of the present one

रेफात्परं च ॥ ४ ॥

4 Also a consonant that follows *r*

The *r* itself being, by rule 15, not liable to duplication. This is the rule second in importance in the whole system, and is found in all the *Pratīcākhyas* and in Pāṇini. The Ath Prat (iii 31), the Vāṅ Prat (iv 98), and Pāṇini (viii 4 46) ascribe the same effect to *h* as to *r* and it is strange that our treatise, which is so liberal in its citation of discordant opinions, makes no reference to one so well supported as this. After *h* we find in the *Sanhitā* only the three nasals specified in rule xxi 14 as requiring the insertion of a *nāsi-kyā*, and the three semivowels *y*, *r*, *v*, *ṛ*, on the other hand, forms numerous groups as first member. I have noted twenty-four of two consonants, forty-three of three consonants, and five of four consonants, a few of them are exempted from duplication by rules 16, 20–23. The cited examples are *ancanty ankam arkanah* (16 12)³

3 *ekeshāmi* ¹ *mate lavakārapārva* ² *sparga* ³ *eva dvivarnam* ⁴ *āpnoti* ⁵ *anena* ⁶ *vadhān anena sūtrāntarānambhanena ca pānush-kan asādimate lavakārayoḥ ca dvitvam asti* ⁷ *ti gamyate*

idam eva sūtram ishtam na tu pārvam ⁸ *pārvoktāny* ⁹ *evo* ¹⁰ *dāharānmi*

¹ G M O ms *ācāryānām* ² B *rvaḥ ca*, G M put after *eva* ³ G M *śapara*, as also in the rule ⁴ O *dvitvam* ⁵ G M O *āpadyate* ⁶ O om ⁷ O *sūtram* ⁸ O *ukt-*

1 e *arccantiṣṣ arkkan arkkanah*), *arkyena vā* (vii 5 9¹ 1 e *arkk-yena* wanting in O), and *ārṣ vā udumbanah* (v 1 10¹ et al 1 e *ārṣṣ vā*)

The *ca*, 'also,' of the rule, according to the commentator, implies duplication, and precedence of the *r* by a vowel (bringing down *svarapūrvā* from rule 1) The question is raised by an objector whether sequence of the consonant following the *r* by another consonant (in virtue of *vyāñjanaparāṇam* in rule 1) is not also implied but such sequence is declared not obligatory, and it is pointed out that later rules (15,16), exempting a consonant in *paśā*, and a spirant before a vowel, from duplication after *r*, prove that the present rule prescribes duplication also where no consonant follows, and where a vowel follows, since there would be no propriety in denying by a special rule what had not been already enjoined by a general rule In support of his assertion that the *r* must be preceded by a vowel, the commentator cites the word *tryambakam* (1 8 6²), in which he says that the *y* must not be doubled and he fortifies his claim by appealing to Pāṇini's rule (vii 4 46), which expressly restricts duplication after *r* and *h* to cases in which these letters follow a vowel (G M add the remark that in Pāṇini also no implication of *vyāñjanaparāṇam*, 'followed by a consonant,' is found) The Vāṇ Pī (iv 102) makes an equivalent restriction explicitly The groups are not numerous in the Tattiriya-Saṅhitā in which a *r* that does not stand first is followed by a consonant, and the only consonant so following is *y* the combinations are *gry*, *try*, *ñtry*, *ttry*, *ntry*, *stiy*, and *tstiy*

This finishes the proper exposition and illustration of the rule, but the commentator suffers himself to be enticed into a lengthy and tedious refutation of a trivial suggestion which some one has been impertinent enough to make There are those, he says, who

4 *rephāt param*¹ *vyāñjanam*² *dvivarnam āpadyate*³ ⁴ *yathā*⁴
arc-----⁵ *arky*-----⁶ *ārṣ*-----⁷ *svarapūrvādvitvayor ākar-*
*shakaṣ cakārah nanu*⁸ *vyāñjanaparatvākaṣhakah kim na syāt*
*ne 'ti brūmah nīyamābhāvāt tathā hi avasāne*⁹ (xiv 15)
ūśhmā svarapara (xiv 16) *ity etannashedhadvayena rephāt pa-*
*rasya*¹⁰ *vyāñjanasya*¹¹ *vyāñjanaparatvābhāve*¹² *svarapūrvatve*¹³ *'pi*
*dvitvam aṣṭi 'ti nigṣṭyate*¹⁴ *aprasaktapratiśedhānupapattē*¹⁵
*svarapūrvatvānvādegena*¹⁶ *kim tryambakam ity ādāu mā*
*bhād iti kim ca*¹⁷ *aco rahābhīyām dve iti*¹⁸ *pāṇinīyasūtenā*
*'pi svarapūrvatve saty eva*¹⁹ *dvitvam vidhīyate*²⁰ ²¹ *tisya*²¹ *'yam*
arthah aca uttarāu yāu repahakārāu tābhīyām uttarasya yaro
*dve bhuvata*²² ²³ *iti*²³

*kecā evam ūcuh*²⁴ *svarapūrvādhīṣadavaḍ repapūrvam ity*
*vācyē*²⁵ *vāco*²⁶ *yuktyantaram arthāntaram samarthayati*²⁷ *aḥur*
---- *ity ādāu*²⁸ *vākrtarephād*²⁹ *uttarasya*³⁰ *'na syād dvitvam*³¹ *iti*
*tad etadudhīyamanvruddhapaddhatim adhyāste*³² *vayam tu va-*

maintain that the analogy of *svarapūrvam* in rule 1 would require *rephapūrvam*, 'preceded by r,' to be employed here (instead of *rephāt param*, 'following r'), and that the difference of phraseology intimates a difference of meaning—namely, that a consonant coming after a *r* which is the product of euphonic alteration, as in *āhar devānām āsit* (159² only W B have *āsīt*), is not doubled. But this, he replies, enters upon a path which is at variance with the reading of this *śākhā*, and he proposes himself to set forth the true ground of the different term employed. If *rephapūrvam*, namely, were used, the rule would be liable to the suspicion of meaning the direct opposite of its real intent, since *rephapūrvam* admits of being understood as *rephāt pūrvam*, 'preceding r'. And if it be retorted that this false implication is of no account, since the case it would involve is already provided for in the first rule of the chapter, and the present rule would be a mere useless repetition, and that the avoidance of such repetition is of itself enough to refute the implication—then the farther reply is made, that that is not sound doctrine, in view of the principle stated in the verse "non-contact with mud is far preferable to the washing of it off," and the teacher uttered the rule in its form as given, with the intent that not even a particle of suspicion of wrong meaning should find occasion from it.

There is no good reason to suppose that the author of the treatise, in saying *rephāt param*, intended to do anything more than use a lawful discretion in the selection of his phraseology. The ambiguity which the commentator ascribes to the other reading is suffered to pass in numberless other cases. The more desirable cleanliness of him who has incurred no need of ablution has been referred to once before (under iv 23), in a case somewhat similar.

*dāmo vāco yuktyantaraprayojanam rephapūrvam ity ukte viruddhavigraheṇa²⁹ sūtram samdigdham syāt rephāt pūrvam rephapūrvam³⁰ iti bhanatu³¹ esha³² vighraha iti cet adhyāyādīśā-
tīnāḥ 'tad gutam iti³³ pūnaruktyam asya sūtrasyā 'padyate.
nanu pūnaruktyabhayād eva viruddhavigraham nirārayāmaḥ³⁴.
ne 'yam saralā vṛttih prakṣālanād dhi³⁵ pañkṣya dāḥ ad aspar-
ṣanam varam iti³⁶ nyāyād³⁷ atra viruddhagaṇkāleḥ 'pi nā 'vaktā-
ḥam labhatām iti vāco yuktyantareṇa sūtram ācāryaḥ provāca*

¹ G M ins ca. ² O *ānīvam āpmo*. ³ G M ins *svarapūrvavatvānīvam* *āhar-
shakap cakārah na tu vyañjanaparivākarśhakah* ⁴ in G M only. ⁵ O om.
⁶ G M *cakāro* only. ⁷ G M *ātha na* (xiv 14) *ity uturanishedhadvikāre avā-
śānavasarganīyāyāhvāmūlīyopadhmanīyāh* (xiv 15). ⁸ W O *paraḥ ca*.
⁹ W B om. ¹⁰ W B *vena*, O *bhāne*, G M om. ¹¹ G M *-aparavte*, O om.
¹² O *gamyate*, G M *niḥcaye katham*. ¹³ G M *ktasya pra*. ¹⁴ O *-vādv*. ¹⁵ G M
om. ¹⁶ W O *evam*. ¹⁷ G M ins *tat katham aco rahādhyān āve*. ¹⁸ G M
asy. ¹⁹ G M *sta*. ²⁰ G M add *tatrā 'pi vyañjanaparavtaprasaktir na drīyate*.
²¹ O *āhuh*. ²² B om. ²³ W om. ²⁴ G M *rephāt param* *iti vāco*. ²⁵ G M *yatr 'ti*
arthāntarasyā 'ddharanam ucyate. ²⁶ G M *atra*. ²⁷ W om *vādvāta*. ²⁸ G M
vyañjanasya dvītvam na syād. ²⁹ O *-āsita*. ³⁰ W *viruddhān* *iti grahanena*, G M.
O *-hane*. ³¹ W B *pūrvam*, O corrupt. ³² W B *bhāvāt*. ³³ G M *eshu*. ³⁴ G,
M *tatah*. ³⁵ O *-ma* *iti cet*. ³⁶ G *panke* *'ti*, B om *varam*. ³⁷ G M *-yena*.

द्वितीयचतुर्थयोस्तु व्यञ्जनोत्तरयोः पूर्वः ॥ ५ ॥

5 In place, however, of second and fourth mutes, when followed by consonants, is put the preceding mute

That is to say, when an aspirate occurs between a preceding vowel (as the commentator specifies in his paraphrase of the rule) and a following consonant, or in such circumstances that by rule 1 it would be doubled, it receives instead an increment (*āgama*) of the mute next preceding it in its own series, or of its corresponding non-aspirate. Examples are *vikhyāya* (1 e *vikkhyāya*) *caḥshushā tvam* (iv 1 2³ only G M have the last two words) and *meghyā* (1 e *megghyā*) *vidyuto vācah* (v 2 11¹ only G M have *vācah*), to which W B add *tat savituh* (15 6⁴ et al), the *t* is converted to *th* by xiv 12, and to the *th* is then prefixed *t*, making *tatth savituh* and *sādhyā* (1 e *sāddhyā*) *vā devāh* (vi 3 4⁸ et al). To show that only the aspirates are thus treated, is quoted *ādyaṃ* (1 e *ād-dyaṃ*) *asyā 'nnam* (ii 2 5⁶ O omits *annam*), to show that a vowel must precede, *vashat svāhā* (vii 3 12, by v 33, *t* is inserted between *t* and *s*, and the inserted letter is made *th* by xiv 12, then, by this rule, no farther change of the *th* occurs, and we read *vashattth*, not *vashatttth*, W goes so far on this road as to read *vashath svāhā* and *paddbhyām* (1 e *paddbhyām*, not *paddbbhyām*) *dve savane* (vi 1 6⁴)—but G M O substitute for the former another similar case, *vat svayamabhiḡartāya* (iii 2 8¹ seven times 1 e *vattth sv*—, O writes *vattth sv*)—, to show that a consonant must follow, *ukhyāyā sadane sre* (iv 1 9³ et al W B omit *sre*) and *meghāyate svāhā* (vii 5 11¹). The word *tu*, 'however,' in the rule, the commentator (with more than his usual success in dealing with this particle) explains as intimating the denial of duplication, enjoined by rule 1. He adds that some give the particle a different interpretation, as

5 *dvitīyacaturthayoh¹ svarapūrvayor vyañjanottarayoh pūrvā-gamo bhavati yathāki amena dvitīyasya prathamāc caturthasya tritīyah yathā² vi----- me----- 'tat----- sā-----³ dvitī-yacaturthayor iti kin ādyam----- evampūrvā⁴ iti kin va-shat----- pad----- evamparayo⁵ iti kin ukh----- megh----- prathamusūtrenā prasaktam dvitvam nivan tayati tuṣabdhah anye tv anyathā manyante pūrvāgamasya dvitvam nivan tayati⁶ 'ti nāi 'tat sām savanā savargīyapara (xiv 23) ity uttaranishedhā⁷ eva tasya tannivrtti⁷*

atra kecid āhuḥ vyañjanaparayor iti vācye⁸ vāco yuktyanta-ram arthāntaram sūcayati⁹ sāmhitāsāmhitāsādhāranam¹⁰ para-nimittam¹¹ uktam¹² tata¹³ ihā 'nyaturastha¹⁴ āgamanimittatve prāpte 'sāmhitapadānām nityatvāt tadgrahanam¹⁵, eva¹⁶ nyāyyam iti krtvā vāḥkrtavvyañjanaparatve sati nāi 'tad vidhānam bhavati¹⁷ yathā abhy asthād ity ādi nā 'yam pakshah adhyayuna-

signifying that the increment-consonant is not itself to be doubled, but justly pronounces this to be inappropriate, as such duplication is forbidden by rule 23 of this chapter

In this and the three following rules is contained, for all the cases which come within the purview of the Prāṭiśākhya, the explicit prohibition of a double aspirate. Such double aspirates are, however, sometimes written by the Hindu scribes, both in situations where the authority of the phonetic treatises directly forbids them, and elsewhere. Thus, my manuscript of the Tāttirīya-Saṃhitā has, three times, *dh dh* instead of *d dh* as the result of combination of *t* and *h* (at ii 6 12⁵ iii 4 1⁴ v 3 12²), and the Calcutta edition, so far as printed, gives, unadvisedly, the same. Both authorities agree in reading *dhādhāhi* at iii 1 11⁴. The edition, absurdly enough, gives *adhaththāh* at i 1 13², where my manuscript has *adhatthāh*. And I find a few cases of *khh* and *chch*, which will be noted under rule 8, below.

As under the preceding rule, the commentator here also enters into a tedious and useless discussion of a verbal question, namely, why 'followed by consonants' is represented by *vyāñjanottarayoh* instead of *vyāñjanaparayoh*. Some, he says, have maintained that a difference of meaning is intended by the difference of phraseology, that it is desired, namely, to except cases like *abhy asthāt* (iv 2 8¹), where the following consonant is the product of euphonic alteration. The ground alleged for this claim is not entirely clear to me. It seems to be that a specified following cause (one that produces an effect in something that precedes it) is common to the *saṃhitā*-text and that which is not *saṃhitā*, hence, a cause of increment occurring in either kind of text being in question, a citation of words from outside the *saṃhitā* is alone suitable, on account of their constancy—that is, *abhi asthāt* not being citable as an example under the rule in its *pada*-form, it must not be so treated in its *saṃhitā*-form, as well. But the claim is disallowed, as being opposed to the actual reading, and also to the fundamental

*virodhān mūlasūtravivodhāc*¹⁸ *ca tathā hi mūlasūtre svarapūrvatve vyāñjanapanatve*¹⁹ *ca sati vihitam*²⁰ *dvitvam atra nishpādyate*²¹ *na tu*²² *tatra vyāñjanam viśeṣitam tadapavādatvād atrā*²³ *'pi tadviśeṣo vaktum ayuktah*²⁴ *śikṣhādpārīkṣanāt*²⁵ *adhyayanānurodhāc ca vāco yuktyantarābhīprāyo 'smābhir abhidhīyate*²⁶ *apavādyāpavādakayor*²⁷ *anayor*²⁸ *nyamo nā 'sti kim iti*²⁹ *svarapūrvatve sati vyāñjanaparam eva vyāñjanam*³⁰ *dvitvam*³¹ *bhājate*³² *dvitviyacaturthāu ca*³³ *vyāñjanapanāu*³⁴ *eva pūrva-gamam*³⁵ *bhājata iti kim tu prācuryābhīprāyene 'dam sūtra-dvayam pravṛttam katham nyamābhāvah anyathā*³⁶ *kutracit kāryadvayadarśanāt*³⁷ *attā----* *annapata ityādāu dvitvam pra----- adāhi----* *ityādāu pūrvāgamah*³⁸ *tāñ hasta ity atra tu*³⁹ *prāptāu satyām upi ne 'dam kāryam dṛṣyata iti ca*⁴⁰ *nyamābhāvah śikṣhā cār 'vam vakṣyati*

rule For, the intent is to cast out or deny a duplication established by the fundamental rule (xiv 1), where the being preceded by a vowel and followed by a consonant was implied, and there no limitation was laid down for the following consonant, hence, it is improper to lay one down here, where an exception is prescribed

The commentator then goes on to say that he will set forth the real intent of the difference of phraseology, with due regard to the Çikshâ, and in accordance with the accepted reading of the text But I am compelled to confess myself incapable of extracting a satisfactory meaning from his exposition and argument The point of it is an asserted absence of *niyama* in the two rules (1 and 5), as of one suffering and the other prescribing exception *Niyama*, 'obligatory force,' appears to signify joint application, and so a mutual or reciprocal influence When a vowel precedes, he continues, a consonant is doubled only when followed by a consonant, and second and fourth mutes take increment of the mute that stands before them in the alphabet only when followed by a consonant But the pair of rules in question is constructed with the intent of multiplicity ('diversity' or 'independence?' *prācurya* is not found elsewhere) How does an absence of *niyama* appear? Why, from the fact that otherwise a twofold effect would in some cases come to light In *attā havīṣṣi* (ii 6 12²) and in *annapate* (iv 2 3¹ et al), and so on, there is duplication, in *prachac chandah* (iv 3 12³ G M have instead *acchāvākah*, the reference for which I have failed to note) and *addhi tvam deva prayatā* (ii 6 12⁵ G M O omit *prayatā*), and so on, there is increment of a preceding mute, but in *tān haste* (vi 1 3⁷ W has *tāns te* [iv 1 10²], but doubtless by accidental omission of *ha*), even though it falls under the rule, the same effect is not seen hence, there is

svarāt⁴⁰ pūrvasya⁴¹ varnasya kvaciḍ dvitvam ca kathyate⁴²
na ca vargadvitiyasya na caturthe kadā⁴³ cama
vyākhyātām ca vacanam etadvivadbhāh
kutravit svarayor madhye dvitvam lakṣhyānusāratah
pūrvāgamas tathā tatra jñeyo va navacakṣanāh
⁴⁴ evam āpam aniyamam sūcayitum vyañjanottarayor⁴⁵ ity anta-
rasvikārah⁴⁶

vyañjanam uttaram yābhyān tān⁴⁷ vyañjanottarān⁴⁸ tayoh

¹ G M O put next before *pūrv-*, O adding *tu* 'in O only' ² G M O om
⁴ G M O *svaparavayor* ⁵ G M *vyañjanottarayor* ⁶ B *utratratras-*, G M
utrasutratras- ⁷ G M O *tteh-* O om *tan* ⁸ B om ⁹ G M O *tr 'h*, G M
add *tatra* ¹⁰ G M *samihitasam-* ¹¹ G M *paramam*, O *uktam* ¹² O om
¹³ O *tatra* ¹⁴ G M *rasya* ¹⁵ W O om *tad*, B *gunam* ¹⁶ W O *evam*, M
exchanges the places of *eva* and *iti* ¹⁷ O *tr 'h* ¹⁸ O om *sutra* ¹⁹ O *nama*
trapar ²⁰ G M *-ta*, O puts after *dvitvam*, and adds *ity* ²¹ G M *navadhhyate*,
O *vepshyate* ²² W B O *nu* ²³ W B *tatr* ²⁴ G M *yuktah* ²⁵ W *-dipavaca*
ksh-, G M *na* ²⁶ O *adhiksh-* ²⁷ W B *apavudap* ²⁸ G M *na 'sti virodha*
iti ²⁹ O *paramam* ³⁰ W om ³¹ O ins *svapūrv* ³² B *tu*, O om ³³ O
parāv ³⁴ W *me*, G M *-muu* ³⁵ B G M ins *'pi* ³⁶ G M ins *katham* ³⁷ W
B *-mam* ³⁸ O om ³⁹ W om ⁴⁰ O *ra* ⁴¹ W *sarvasya* ⁴² G M *vakshyate*
⁴³ G M *katham* ⁴⁴ O ins *ity* ⁴⁵ O *-janayor* ⁴⁶ G M O *uttarasv* ⁴⁷ G M
tad ⁴⁸ G M *ram*

absence of *nyāma* The examples here furnished, which ought to give us the clue to the commentator's meaning, seem to leave us wholly in the dark, since not one of them falls under either of the rules in question the first, second, and fourth are by rule 23, below, exempt from duplication, the third is a case under rule 8, and the combination *ñh* is (see under rule 15) treated as a simple *h* Next, the Çikshā is quoted, to the effect that "in some cases, also, duplication of the first consonant of a group after a vowel is prescribed, not, however, of a second mute, nor of a fourth, under any circumstances," and, by those versed in the subject, the statement is explained [in conformity with what follows] "in some cases, there is duplication of a consonant between two vowels, in accordance with rule, so there also is to be understood prefixion of the preceding mute, by those skilled in alphabetic sounds" (in the known Çikshā, it may be remarked, no such verses as these are to be found) And the final conclusion is, that the different term in *vyāñyanottarayoh* is intended to signify an absence of *nyāma* of this sort That is to say, perhaps, the real independence of the two rules is intimated by the choice of a different term in expressing the common factor which they contain

रेफपूर्वयोश्च नित्यम् ॥ ६ ॥

6 As also, in all cases, when they follow 1

This, it is pointed out, has the value of an exception under rule 4 The dual number of *rephapūrvayoh* shows that the pair, "second and fourth mutes," spoken of just above, is intended "Also" (*ca*) implies the increment by prefixion of the next preceding mute And the meaning is, that second and fourth mutes, with the limitations prescribed, as preceded by *r*, take always then respective predecessors as increment Thus, *ūrdhvo* (1 e *ūrdhvo*) *bhava* (1 2 14²) and *arāhyavān* (1 e *arādhya*-) *prānah* (vi 5 2² only G M have *prānah*) *Nityam*, 'in all cases,' implies that the increment is made after *r* when the mute to be increased is followed by a vowel also (not alone when it is *vyāñyanottara*, as specified in rule 5) Thus, in *artheta* (1 e *arth-*) *sthā 'pām* (18 11 only B has *apām*), *mārkhām* (1 e *mārkkhām*) *tayaghanyām* (vii 1 6⁴), and *goarggham* (1 e *goarggham*) *eva* (vi 1 10¹)

लकारपूर्वे च ॥ ७ ॥

6 *rephāt param ca* (xiv 4) *ity asyā 'pavādakam etat' dvi-*
vacanena dvitīyacaturthāu grhyete savicēshanayo' rephapū-
vayor anayor' nityam pūrvāgamo bhavati' āgamānvādeṣakaṣ
cahārah. yathā⁵ ūrdh-.... arāhy-.... nityam ite kun
svaraparavte 'pi bhavatu' etad ite anthe-.... mārkhām-....
go-....

¹ W *avādāt* ² W B *navi*, G M O *-shanāu* ³ O *tayor* ⁴ O *syāt* ⁵ in G M only ⁶ G M *-ty*

7 And when *l* precedes

The *ca*, 'and,' here brings down from rule 5 only the fourth mute [the last of the two there mentioned] and the increment. The second mute is not also included, because (see note to rule 2) no second mute occurs after *l* in the Saṁhita. The examples are *pagalbho* (1 e -galbbho) 'sya jāyate (11 5 5³ only G M have jāyate) and *namo madhyamāya cā 'pagalbhāya* (1 e -galbbh-) *ca* (11 5 6¹)—but, in place of the latter, G M give *apagalbho jāyate* (11 5 5³ O reads *agayalya* simply, which doubtless means the first word of this)

As was remarked above (under rule 3), the laying down of the present precept without any limitation appears to confirm the commentator's interpretation of rules 2 and 3, as teaching the accepted doctrine of the *gāhā*. It would, to be sure, be not impossible to understand *lbbh* for *lbh* as required here, without any reference to the other groups—*lk*, *lg* etc.—in which the duplication after *l* depends upon the earlier rules, but that seems quite unlikely

उपसर्गपाथेषोऽन्यातिथामपरमभूतेपूर्वेषु ह्रस्विभुजेषु
च ॥८॥

8 Also the preceding mute is inserted before *ch*, *kh*, and *bhya*, when these follow either a preposition, *pāṭha eshaḥ*, *atī*, *āti*, *dhāma*, *parama*, or *bhūte*

The examples after a preposition (in which situation alone the increment of *kh* and *bhya* is made) are first given by the commentator: they are *ā cchruṇatti* (v 1 7⁴ the preceding word, *anācchruṇam*, might well have been included, as an additional instance, my MS has simple *ch* in both cases), *nama akkṛdate ca prakṛdate ca* (11 5 9² G M omit the first word, G M O the last two), *ayaśkṛmayā paribbhuyā* (11 5 1⁴), with *vibhu ca me prabhu ca me* (11 7 4^{1 2} O stops at the first *me*) as counter-example, to show the necessity of saying *bhya*, instead of *bhu* simply, in the rule, and *yā ca vicchandāḥ* (v 2 11¹). Then follow counter-examples: first, to show that *kh* is increased only when followed by *i*, *nikhātum manushyānām* (v 1 3 4⁶) and *datṣv adhi khādati* (v 2 11⁴ only G M have *datṣv*), next, to show that the increment takes place only after a preposition, *sachandā yā* (v 2 11¹). The examples after the remaining words, as particularly specified in the rule, are *priyam apy eti pāṭhaḥ esha cchāgah* (11 6 8¹ only O has *priyam*), with *rtubhir vā esha chandobhir* (v 11 5 15²), to prove the need of quoting *pāṭhaḥ* along with *esha* in the rule, *aticchan-*

7 cakāraḥ catuṣthāgamayor¹ ākarṣakāḥ caturthasparṣe² lakāḥ apūrve sati pūrvaḥ gamo bhuvati prag---- namo---- lakārah pūrvo yasmād asāu³ lakārapūrvāḥ tasmin

¹ G M -gam ² G M the sp ³ G M O sa

dasam upa dadhāti (v 3 8³), *savitā ātrecchandāsāya* (vii 5 14), *dhāmacchad va khalu vā* (ii 4 10² B O omitt *vā*), *paramacchado vare* (iv 6 2¹), and *yad bhāteccadāñ sāmāni* (vii 5 9⁴)

Further examples of the increment of *ch*, falling under this rule, are *ācchad* and *pracchad* (at iv 3 12^{2,3}) and *ācchettā* (i 1 2¹) if there are others, I have omitted to note them. The usage in the manuscripts, of our commentary and of the Sanhitā, is quite irregular, varying between *ch* simply, *ech*, and *chch*, without much regard to whether the case is one to which this rule applies or not. I have collected the cases in which my manuscript of the Sanhitā has *chch* they are *dhāmachchad* (ii 4 10², but *dhāmuchad* in the same division), *prachchach chandah* (iv 3 12³), and *āyuchchad-bhaya* (iv 5 3²), and, in the combination of separate words (besides the case just quoted), *ācchach chandah* (iv 3 12²), *kakuch chundah* (iii 1 6³), and *yach chreshthah* (iii 4 8¹). In every one of these instances, the Calcutta edition, so far as it yet reaches, reads correctly *ech*.

I have found no other cases of the increment of *kh* under the rule, but my manuscript has (without authority) *udukkhkhudat* (ii 1 1^{4,5}), *sam akkhkhudat* (vi 6 11¹), and *akkhkhudāh* (iii 5 8), while (along with the MSS of the comment) it reads *khkh* instead of *khkh* in the example (iv 5 9²) cited above. The edition reads *khkh* at ii 1 1^{4,5}, remarking at the latter place that its manuscript authorities have *khkh*. Of course, the doubled aspirate is to be rejected, here as elsewhere, in obedience to sound phonetic theory as well as to the concordant authority of the Prātivākhyas.

अघोषाद्भ्रमणः परः प्रथमो ऽभिनिधानं स्पर्शपरा-
त्तस्य सस्थानः ॥ १ ॥

9 After a surd spirant followed by a mute is inserted a first mute of the same position with the latter, as *abhimudhāna*

The surd spirants are (see i 9, 12, 13) five, namely *x* (*phvāmāliya*), *ç*, *sh*, *s*, and *φ* (*upadhmanīya*). The rule is to be paralleled with those in the Vāj Pr (iv 99, 100), which direct that a mute be doubled after a spirant, and after *phvāmāliya* and *upadhmanīya* (which in that treatise are not reckoned as spirants), also with

8 *upasargapūrveshu pāṭha*.... *evampūrveshu ca¹ satsu cha*
khu bhuge² 'ty eteshu pūrvāgamo bhavati³ cakāru āgamānvādega-
kah yathā⁴ ā.... *nama*.... *ayuk*.... *je⁵ 'ti kim vibhu*
.... *yā*.... *'khī⁶ 'ti kim nikh*.... *datstv*.... *upasarga⁷*
iti kim sa.... *etāny upasargapūrvāni anyāny⁸ ucyante.*
prīyam.... *pāṭha iti kim rtubhir*.... *atv*.... *savitā*
.... *dhāma*.... *parama*.... *yad*....

¹ G M om ² O syāt ³ G M O om ⁴ O om ⁵ G M *rgapurva* ⁶ G M
O ins *apy*

that in the Rik Pr. (vi.2) which allows, but does not require, duplication of a mute after the spirants (namely *ç, sh, s, h, z, ç, ñ*). The Ath. Pr. (unless such a precept is lost by the *lacuna* occurring in the treatment of this subject: see note to Ath. Pr. iii. 28) and Pāṇini have nothing similar. Our rule, however, is quite alone so far as the treatment of a nasal after a spirant is concerned, making an insertion of a surd non-aspirate, instead of a nasal: and, as will be seen, the next rule quotes an opinion which would bring the Tāittirīya usage more nearly into accordance with that of the Rik and Vājasaneyi Sanhitās; but the commentator pronounces that opinion unapproved.

The examples quoted are as follows: *yah kāmāyeta* (i. e. *yax kām-*: ii.1.2³ et al.); *āçmann* (i. e. *açpman*, or, after all rules are applied, *açpp̄man*) *ūrjam* (iv.6.1¹: O. omits the example and puts here, instead of below, that for *ç*); *grīshme* (i. e. *grīshpme* or *grīshshp̄me*) *madhyandine* (ii.1.2⁵); *ayasmāyam* (i. e. *ayasp̄mayam* or *ayasspp̄mayam*) *vi c̄rtā bandham* (iv.2.5³: only W. has *bandham*); *yah pāpmanā* (i. e. *yax ppā-*: ii.3.13²): O. adds to this last *tasmin* (vii.1.5¹ et al.: to be treated like *ayasmāyam*, above), and, after *madhyandine*, *prā'c̄nāti* (*prāçc̄t̄nāti*: I have overlooked this citation in searching out the references). As counter-examples, we have first *çarady aparāhne* (ii.1.2⁵: but O. substitutes *brahmavādino vadanti*, i.7.1⁴ et al.), to show that the sonant spirant, *h*, does not require a like insertion (the case is one of *nāsikya*, xxi. 14); then *rukman upa dadhāti* (v.2.7^{1,2}: the case is one for *yama*, xxi.12), to show that a mute receives the increment only after a spirant; and lastly *ishvā ca vajreṇa ca* (v.7.3¹), to show that a mute only is increased after a spirant. For the second of these counter-examples, O. substitutes two of the same character, namely *yam apnavānah* (i.5.5¹) and *sa pratnavat* (ii.2.12¹ et al.); for the last, it gives (in a passage which has strayed out of place, and got inserted near the end of the comment to rule 10) *agnaye svāhā* (i.2.2¹ et al.).

In all these combinations, *ç* and *ç* are exempt from duplication by xiv.15, but the sibilants are doubled, except as some authorities (xiv.17,18) would leave them unchanged.

9. *sparçaparād aghoshād āshmanah parah¹ prathamā² āgamas³ tasya sparçasya sasthanah⁴ samānasthāno bhiniḍhāno bhavati. abhinidhīyata⁵ ity abhinidhānah: āropanīya ity arthah: ⁶vedāntare tasyā⁷ bhāvād atrā ⁸ropanīyatvam. yathā: yah----: ⁹açm-----: ¹⁰grīsh-----: ayasm-----: yah----- aghoshād iti kim: çarady----- āshmana iti kim: ¹¹rukman-----: ¹²sparçaparād iti kim: ishvā-----*

sūtram idam eve 'shtam: na tatparadvayam¹⁰.

¹ G. M. om. ² B. O. *pratham*. ³ G. M. *-mo bhavati*. ⁴ B. om. ⁵ W. O. *-dhāyata*; R. *-nīyata*. ⁶ G. M. *vedāntarasyā*; O. *-reṇa tad a*. ⁷ G. M. O. om. ⁸ O. om. ⁹ O. *yam apnavānah: sa pratnavat*, and om. all that follows (but see various readings to next rule). ¹⁰ G. M. *tu par-*.

The commentator illustrates with groups of two consonants only (of which the Sanhitā presents twenty three that would come under the action of the rule), the question arises, then, whether in groups of three or more consonants (of which there are over fifty)—where the mute is followed by another consonant (as *χhl, çny, shky, stm, stry, çpr*), or where the spirant stands second (as *çm, kshn, rshny, tsk, tsphy*), or where each is the case (as *tstr, tsty, ntstr*), or where there are two spirants followed by mutes in the same group (as *χkshn*)—the rule is to be relentlessly applied. It can admit of little doubt that the sequence of another consonant would not affect the case, whether a preceding consonant would do so is more doubtful. Such resultant groups as *nthstr, tthspphy, kkhshtny, and χkkhshñ*, have a tolerably frightful appearance, but whether they would stagger the heroic soul of a Hindu çākhin, is another matter.

To the inserted mute is applied the name *abhimadhānu*, which the commentator explains by *abhimadhiyate*, 'it is set down against,' giving as its synonym *āropanīya*, (I presume, simply) 'to be inserted,' and adding the remark, "owing to the absence of this in any other Veda, there is here insertibility" (2). He takes no notice of the doctrine of *abhimadhānu* as a peculiar and imperfect utterance of certain letters in certain situations, which plays so formidable a part in the phonetic systems of the Rik and Ath Prātiçākhyas (see especially the note to Ath Pr 143) we, however, bearing that doctrine in mind, may conjecture with plausibility that the word here not merely signifies an insertion, but designates also a peculiar quality of the inserted letter.

अघोषे प्लक्षेः ॥ १० ॥

10 According to Plākshī, when the following mute is said

That is to say, not when it is a nasal. Plākshī would ratify *χkh, χkkh, shñ, shññ*, and so on, but would make no insertion in *çm, shn*, and then like. This, as was remarked under the last rule, would correspond more nearly with the teachings of the Rik and Vaj Prātiçākhyas. The commentator illustrates with *nishkevalyam* (iv 4 22), *yah kāmaveta* (ii 1 23 et al), *paççat prāññ* (v 3 73). B reads *prāññ*, which is found in the same division, W has *prāññam*, which does not occur in the Sanhitā after *paççat*, *nish tapāni* (i 1 101), *doshāvastah* (i 2 144 et al), *yah pāpmanā* (ii 3

10 ¹ *aghosha eva sparçat pare* ² *saty ughoshād āshmanah* ³ *prathamāgama* ⁴ *bhavati* ⁵ *plāksheh pakshah* ⁶ *yuthā* ⁷ *nish----* ⁸ *yah----* ⁹ *paçç-----* ¹⁰ *nish----* ¹¹ *aksh-----* ¹² *dosh----* ¹³ *yah-----* ¹⁴ *āsp-----* ¹⁵ *aghosha eve* ¹⁶ *ti kum kū çmāñ-----* ¹⁷

¹ O ins *plākshes çākhino mate* ² W B G M çā, O çe pr ³ O *prathamam* ⁴ G M ins *parah* ⁵ O om ⁶ G M O om, W puts out of place, before *aksh* ⁷ G M om ⁸ O substitutes *suçcandra* ⁹ *paraparādā* ¹⁰ *agn-----* ¹¹ *sūtram idam eve* ¹² *ññam na tu paradravyam* ¹³ *aghosha eva sparçapare prathamā yaç chandasām naç cid ati syātram brhaspatissūrapate* ¹⁴ O adds *abhimadhānavyamo nā'sti*

13²), and *āspātram juhāt devānām* (11 5 9³ G M have only the first word) All these are examples quite needless to be given, as they are read by Plākshī precisely as prescribed by the preceding rule Counter-examples, exhibiting his discordant view, are *kūṣmāṇ chakabhāḥ* (v 7 23 W G M have *kūṣmān* only, and B reads *kūṣmāndān*, which I have not found in the *Sanhitā*, although *kūṣmānda* occurs in the *Taitt Āranyaka*, at 11 7,8) and *akṣhṇayā vyāghārayati* (v 2 7⁵ et al given only by W B, and introduced out of place, between *nish tapāmi* and *doshāvastah*, above)

O follows an independent course in the interpretation and illustration of this rule It calls the insertion an *abhinidhāna* (though adding at the end "there is no obligation of *abhinidhāna*") and, for the examples *yah kāmayeta* to *āspātram*, it substitutes *suṣcandru dasma vīpate havyavāt* (1v 4 4⁶ the MS omits *dasma*), *yaḥ chandasām* (the thing nearest to this that I have found in the text is *prayāpatīḥ chandasām*, 11 3 7¹), *naḥ cid atri* (this I have overlooked in searching out the references), *syātram* (doubtless meant for *āspātram*), and *brhaspatīḥ sūrapate* (probably *brhaspatīḥ sūrasya te*, 1,4 27)

The present precept was pronounced unapproved in the comment to rule 9

उत्तमपरात्तु प्लक्षायणस्य ॥ ११ ॥

11 But according to Plākshāyana, on the contrary, when the following mute is a nasal

This can only mean to teach the precise opposite of the preceding rule, or, that there is no insertion when a surd mute follows the spirant, but only when a nasal follows And it is first so explained by the commentator, who gives as examples *akṣhṇayā vyāghārayati* (v 2 7⁵ et al), *aṣṇātri* (1 6 7³ et al), and *tīrthe snātri*

11 'plākshāyanasya tu paksha uttamaparād aghoshād ūshmanah parah¹ prathamāgamo bhavati yathā² akṣh-... aṣ-
nātri tīrthe-... uttamaparād itī kim nish-... 'yah k-
... 'yah p-... 'paṣcāt tuṣabdhah plākshah paksham prak-
shapati³

kecid evam ūcuh aghoshatvam ūshmanas tuṣabdo nīvartayati
'ti⁴ tatrā 'yam sūtrārthah uttamaparāt tu⁵ ghoshavata⁶ ūshma-
nah pūvāḥ prathamāgamo bhavati aḥnām-... garady-...
brahm-... ghoshavata⁷ itī kim aṣmā-... grīsh-...
ayas-...

(¹) G M om (²) G M om (³) B om (⁴) G M om (⁵) W *apākshayati*, B *kshī-*
yati (⁶) G M om *itī* (⁷) in W only (⁸) G M *ghoshād* (⁹) G M *agh*

O substitutes for the whole comment *aghoshaprakṛtam tuṣabdo nīvartayati plāk-*
kshāyanasya pūvāḥ aghoshād ūshmanah uttamaparāparat sasthanapraitha-
māgamo bhavati akṣh-... grī-... ṣnātri aya-

(v 1 1²), and, as counter-examples, *nishkevalyam* (iv 4 2²), *yah kāmāyeta* (ii 1 2³ et al B omits), *yah pāpmānā* (ii 3 13² G M omit), and *paçcāt* (v 2 9⁴ et al) Plākshāyana would read the first class as rule 9 requires, but would leave the mute without increment in the second class

Then a second and wholly different interpretation is set forth as taught by certain authorities namely, that *tu*, 'but,' in the rule, instead of negating Plākshī's opinion, reverses the quality of the spirant as prescribed in rule 9, changing it from surd to sonant—that is to say, admitting the increment only after *h*. The examples given are *ahnām ketuh* (ii 4 14¹), *çarady aparādhne* (ii 1 2⁵ only W has *çarady*), and *brahmavādīno vadanti* (i 7 1⁴ et al W B omit *vadanti*), the counter-examples, illustrating omission of the increment after a surd spirant, are *açmā ca me* (iv 7 5¹), *grishmo hemantah* (v 7 2⁴), and *ayasmayam vi cta* (iv 2 5³ W B omit *cta*). This, which is in itself forced and inadmissible, would also be equivalent to limiting the insertion to the little class of cases in which a later rule (xxi 14) requires the interposition of a *nāsikya*.

In the exposition of this rule, O goes its own peculiar way, and takes no notice of the second interpretation which the other manuscripts report. It furnishes no counter-examples, and its examples agree only in part with those already given they are (connected) *akshnayā vyāghān ayati*, *grishme madhyandine* (ii 1 2⁵), *açnāti* (or *snāti*), and *ayasmayam vi cta*.

The rule was pronounced unapproved by the commentator under rule 9

प्रथम ऊष्मपरो द्वितीयम् ॥ १२ ॥

12 A first mute followed by a spirant is changed into its corresponding aspirate

Literally, becomes a second mute—of course, of its own series. The examples given are as follows *visrpo virapçinn* (i e *viraphçin*, or, by xiv 1, *virappçin*) *udādāya* (i 1 9³ only O has the first word, and it omits the last, W reads *vātrivādāya*, which is evidently merely a corruption), *tat shodag* (i e *-tth sh*) *abhavat* (vi 6 11¹ only G M have *abhavat*), *pratyāñ somah* (i 8 21 i e *pratyāñk s-* by v 32, then *pratyāñk s-*), and *tat* (i e *tutth*)

12 *ūshmaparah prathama sparçah¹ savargīyam dvitīyam āpadyate vis----* *tat----* *praty-----* *tat----* ²*prathama iti kum³ tāk-----* ² *ūshmapara iti kum³ vāk----* ⁴*arvāg-----* *ity atra prathamapūro hakāraç caturtham tasya sa-* *sthānam* (v 38) *iti hakārasya caturthāpattir viçeshavibhāvāt* *tatas trītyaṅ svuraghoshavatparas* (viii 3) *trītyatvam*

idam eva sūtram ishtam⁴

ūshmā paro yasmād asū⁵ ūshmaparah

¹ O *ātmana* ² O om ³ W B om ⁴ in O only ⁵ G M *sa*

savituh (15 6⁴ et al) As counter-examples, we have *tāh* (1 e *tās*, ix 2) *sañrohah* (v 3 6³ omitted by O, dropped out in W B) and *vāk ta ā pyāyatām* (13 9¹ only O has the last two words), in which no aspiration takes place

A possible difficulty in the application of this rule is noticed and removed by O alone. Such a case as *avāk hi enam paḍāh* (vi 3 3¹) might seem to fall under its action, the spuant *h* following a sūd mute. But it is pointed out that, in virtue of v 38, *h* becomes a fourth mute by special prescription, and hence that rule viii 3 alone applies to the preceding surd, changing it to a sonant.

The place of introduction of this precept and the following—coming in, as they do, right in the midst of the rules respecting duplication, with which they stand in no relation—is quite surprising and objectionable. The commentator, however, passes the matter without notice.

I have not noted any case in which my manuscript of the Sanhitā attempts the aspiration of a mute before a sibilant, as here required. The manuscripts of the commentary, however, which almost never heed the rules for duplication, even in illustrating those rules themselves, often (as we have repeatedly had occasion to notice) observe this one in their citations, although they yet more often neglect it (thus, in the examples here given, G M O aspirate the mutes, and W B leave them unchanged). Being taught in company with the duplication, as part of the *varṇa-hiṇna*, it has no claim to be taken account of in the construction of an ordinary Tāttirīya text. Respecting the teachings of the other Prātiçākhyas upon the subject, see the note to Ath P1 ii 6.

बाडभीकारस्यासस्यानपरः ॥ १३ ॥

13 According to Bādabhikāra, when the following spuant is not of the same position with it

Rule ii 44 teaches the avoidance of the several (surd) spiants, in their order, with the series of mutes, in point of position—more literally, of place of production.

T calls the individual here referred to Bādavikāra, and W O have in the rule *vādabhikāra*, but in the comment *bādubh*, the rest have uniformly *b* as initial letter, which I have therefore adopted, as being decidedly better supported than *v*. Weber gives the two forms *vādabh*- (V P1 p 250) and *vātabh*- (ib, p 78).

13 *bādabhikān asya* ¹ *matu ātmano* ² *'sasthānoshmāparah prathamah savargīyam* *dvitīyam āpadyate* *'samānam sthānam yasyā'* *sāu sasthānah na sasthāno* *'sasthānah sa paro yasmāt sa tatho* *'ktaḥ yathā* ³ *vis-* *-- tat----* ⁴ *asasthāna iti kim tat----* ⁵

ne'dam sūtram ishtam

¹ O ins *śākhano* ² G M O om (and begin the next word as) ³ O om ⁴ O om ⁵ B om ⁶ O ins *idārā(?)sthāno yam sakarah*

The commentary (except in O) is at the pains to repeat a couple of the examples of aspiration already given, namely *visrpo visrpo-gin* (11 9³ W omits *visrpo*) and *tat shodasi* (vi 6 11¹) and it adds, in illustration of the peculiar view of the quoted authority, *tat savituh* (15 6⁴ et al), where the dental mute, being followed by the dental sibilant, remains unchanged

This rule is pronounced unapproved

अथ न ॥ १४ ॥

14 Now for exceptions

A heading, introducing the detail of exceptions to the rules as already given, and continuing in force through rule 28

अवसाने रविसर्जनीयजिह्वामूलियोपध्मानीयाः ॥ १५ ॥

15 A consonant before a pause is not doubled, nor *r*, *visarjanīya*, *jihvāmūliya*, or *upadhmanīya*

As example of a consonant before a pause, is given *ārḥ* (iv 7 4¹ et al W has instead so *rkah* [v 4 3³], but it is not an illustration of the rule, and is evidently here only a corrupted reading of *ārḥ*), of which the *k* would otherwise be doubled by xiv 4. Of course, it is only a final after *r* that would fall under the rules of duplication before a pause. The text affords, I believe, no instance of a consonant occurring in this position in *samhitā*, but such words as *ārḥ* and *amārt* (vii 1 1² et al) need to have their reading in the other forms of text determined by a rule like this. The commentator quotes *ārḥ ca* (1 e *ārkk ca*) *me sūrtā ca me* (iv 7 4¹ B omits the last two words, G M O the last three), as showing that the *k* is doubled when in *sandhi* with a following letter. To illustrate the exemption from duplication of the other letters specified, are given *nā* ¹*ṣṭim ārchati* (ii 2 4⁷), *manah ksheme* (v 2 1⁷), *yah* (1 e *yax*) *kāmayeta* (ii 1 2³ et al), and *yah* (1 e *yaṭ*) *pāpmunā* (ii 3 13²). According to the approved usage of this *śākhā* (see ix 2,3), *visarjanīya* comes within the ken of this rule only when it

14 *athe* ¹*'ty ayam adhikārah* ¹ *uktasya dvitvavidher* ² *yathā-sambhavam nishedho* ³ *'dhikrīyata* ⁴ *ity* ⁵ *'etad adhikrtam* ⁶ *vedīta-vyam ita* ⁷ *'uttaram yad vak-hyāmāh*⁵

¹ G M ins *atha* ² W G M *dhe*, O *nāh* ³ W *-kta* ⁴ B G M om ⁵ B no *varnah*

15 *padāvasāne*¹ *vartamāno varno* ² *'repho visarjanīyo jihvāmūliya upadhmanīyaś* ³ *ce* ⁴ *'ty ete varnā dvitvam nā* ⁵ *'padyante* ⁶ *ārḥ rephāt param ca* (xiv 4) *iti prāptih avasānavacanam*⁵ *vīrāmābhīpīḍyam tasmān na samdhāne nishedhah yathā*⁶ *ārḥ ca*---- *nā*---- *man*---- *yah*---- *yah*---- *svara-pūrvam* (xiv 1) *ity anenā* ⁷ *'śhān prāptih*

precedes *ksh*, since elsewhere it can stand only in *pausa* *Tribhāṣhyasūtra* occurs (by the conversion of final *h* according to 1x 2) in the groups *ḥh*, *ḥhl*, *ḥhr*, *ḥksh*, *ḥkshn*, *ḥkshr*, and *ḥhh*, *upadhmanīya*, in like manner, in *pp*, *ppy*, *ppr*, *qpl*, and *qph* the combinations of *r* have been enumerated above (under rule 4)

The other Prātigākyas have rules equivalent with this, into the variety of expression of which we do not need to enter

It is to be accounted as a reprehensible omission on the part of our treatise, that it gives no direction as to the treatment of a group beginning with *anusvāra* The V 11 Prāt (1v 107) expressly exempts *anusvāra* from duplication, and, in the Rik Prāt, in the fundamental rule (vi 1), *anusvāra* is ruled out of account in the estimation of consonant groups, it being taught that a consonant is doubled after it in the same manner as after a vowel There is no good reason to doubt that the same is to be understood as the doctrine of the present work, and that it would have *anusvāra*, so far as duplication is concerned, deemed and taken as merely an affection of the vowel to which it is attached That this is not explicitly stated, stands in connection with the equivocal position of the Tānti Prāt in reference to the nature of *anusvāra* (see p 68) according to the view taken at the beginning of the next chapter (xv 1), rules respecting it are no more required than in the Ath Prāt, where they are equally wanting

The commentator notices that some would read the rule now under discussion as two, cutting off *ai asāne* from the rest, and for the reason that otherwise, as the rule stands, it seems natural to understand that “*i*, *h*, *y*, and *ṣ*, when standing before a pause,” are not doubled, as a similar construction was made in rule 10 of the fifth chapter But he denies the validity of the objection, since duplication of *r* and the rest before a pause is not in the remotest

¹ *avasāna iti* ² *caturndām varnānām* ³ *prthag eva sūtram* ⁴ *kecid*
aiuh ⁵ *ekikarane* ⁶ *doshadan ganāt* ⁷ *asāne* ⁸ *doshah* ⁹ *avasāne* ¹⁰ *var-*
namānā rephavarjanīyādāya ¹¹ *ity anvaṣusampādūnam* ¹² *ai-*
graha āṣṭir dhāh suvar (v 10) ¹³ *itrad iti cet* ¹⁴ *nāi* ¹⁵ *ṣha do-*
shah ¹⁶ *ravisarjanīyādānām* ¹⁷ *padāvasāne* ¹⁸ *ai* ¹⁹ *ai* ²⁰ *ai* ²¹ *ai* ²² *ai* ²³ *ai* ²⁴ *ai* ²⁵ *ai* ²⁶ *ai* ²⁷ *ai* ²⁸ *ai* ²⁹ *ai* ³⁰ *ai* ³¹ *ai* ³² *ai* ³³ *ai* ³⁴ *ai* ³⁵ *ai* ³⁶ *ai* ³⁷ *ai* ³⁸ *ai* ³⁹ *ai* ⁴⁰ *ai* ⁴¹ *ai* ⁴² *ai* ⁴³ *ai* ⁴⁴ *ai* ⁴⁵ *ai* ⁴⁶ *ai* ⁴⁷ *ai* ⁴⁸ *ai* ⁴⁹ *ai* ⁵⁰ *ai* ⁵¹ *ai* ⁵² *ai* ⁵³ *ai* ⁵⁴ *ai* ⁵⁵ *ai* ⁵⁶ *ai* ⁵⁷ *ai* ⁵⁸ *ai* ⁵⁹ *ai* ⁶⁰ *ai* ⁶¹ *ai* ⁶² *ai* ⁶³ *ai* ⁶⁴ *ai* ⁶⁵ *ai* ⁶⁶ *ai* ⁶⁷ *ai* ⁶⁸ *ai* ⁶⁹ *ai* ⁷⁰ *ai* ⁷¹ *ai* ⁷² *ai* ⁷³ *ai* ⁷⁴ *ai* ⁷⁵ *ai* ⁷⁶ *ai* ⁷⁷ *ai* ⁷⁸ *ai* ⁷⁹ *ai* ⁸⁰ *ai* ⁸¹ *ai* ⁸² *ai* ⁸³ *ai* ⁸⁴ *ai* ⁸⁵ *ai* ⁸⁶ *ai* ⁸⁷ *ai* ⁸⁸ *ai* ⁸⁹ *ai* ⁹⁰ *ai* ⁹¹ *ai* ⁹² *ai* ⁹³ *ai* ⁹⁴ *ai* ⁹⁵ *ai* ⁹⁶ *ai* ⁹⁷ *ai* ⁹⁸ *ai* ⁹⁹ *ai* ¹⁰⁰ *ai* ¹⁰¹ *ai* ¹⁰² *ai* ¹⁰³ *ai* ¹⁰⁴ *ai* ¹⁰⁵ *ai* ¹⁰⁶ *ai* ¹⁰⁷ *ai* ¹⁰⁸ *ai* ¹⁰⁹ *ai* ¹¹⁰ *ai* ¹¹¹ *ai* ¹¹² *ai* ¹¹³ *ai* ¹¹⁴ *ai* ¹¹⁵ *ai* ¹¹⁶ *ai* ¹¹⁷ *ai* ¹¹⁸ *ai* ¹¹⁹ *ai* ¹²⁰ *ai* ¹²¹ *ai* ¹²² *ai* ¹²³ *ai* ¹²⁴ *ai* ¹²⁵ *ai* ¹²⁶ *ai* ¹²⁷ *ai* ¹²⁸ *ai* ¹²⁹ *ai* ¹³⁰ *ai* ¹³¹ *ai* ¹³² *ai* ¹³³ *ai* ¹³⁴ *ai* ¹³⁵ *ai* ¹³⁶ *ai* ¹³⁷ *ai* ¹³⁸ *ai* ¹³⁹ *ai* ¹⁴⁰ *ai* ¹⁴¹ *ai* ¹⁴² *ai* ¹⁴³ *ai* ¹⁴⁴ *ai* ¹⁴⁵ *ai* ¹⁴⁶ *ai* ¹⁴⁷ *ai* ¹⁴⁸ *ai* ¹⁴⁹ *ai* ¹⁵⁰ *ai* ¹⁵¹ *ai* ¹⁵² *ai* ¹⁵³ *ai* ¹⁵⁴ *ai* ¹⁵⁵ *ai* ¹⁵⁶ *ai* ¹⁵⁷ *ai* ¹⁵⁸ *ai* ¹⁵⁹ *ai* ¹⁶⁰ *ai* ¹⁶¹ *ai* ¹⁶² *ai* ¹⁶³ *ai* ¹⁶⁴ *ai* ¹⁶⁵ *ai* ¹⁶⁶ *ai* ¹⁶⁷ *ai* ¹⁶⁸ *ai* ¹⁶⁹ *ai* ¹⁷⁰ *ai* ¹⁷¹ *ai* ¹⁷² *ai* ¹⁷³ *ai* ¹⁷⁴ *ai* ¹⁷⁵ *ai* ¹⁷⁶ *ai* ¹⁷⁷ *ai* ¹⁷⁸ *ai* ¹⁷⁹ *ai* ¹⁸⁰ *ai* ¹⁸¹ *ai* ¹⁸² *ai* ¹⁸³ *ai* ¹⁸⁴ *ai* ¹⁸⁵ *ai* ¹⁸⁶ *ai* ¹⁸⁷ *ai* ¹⁸⁸ *ai* ¹⁸⁹ *ai* ¹⁹⁰ *ai* ¹⁹¹ *ai* ¹⁹² *ai* ¹⁹³ *ai* ¹⁹⁴ *ai* ¹⁹⁵ *ai* ¹⁹⁶ *ai* ¹⁹⁷ *ai* ¹⁹⁸ *ai* ¹⁹⁹ *ai* ²⁰⁰ *ai* ²⁰¹ *ai* ²⁰² *ai* ²⁰³ *ai* ²⁰⁴ *ai* ²⁰⁵ *ai* ²⁰⁶ *ai* ²⁰⁷ *ai* ²⁰⁸ *ai* ²⁰⁹ *ai* ²¹⁰ *ai* ²¹¹ *ai* ²¹² *ai* ²¹³ *ai* ²¹⁴ *ai* ²¹⁵ *ai* ²¹⁶ *ai* ²¹⁷ *ai* ²¹⁸ *ai* ²¹⁹ *ai* ²²⁰ *ai* ²²¹ *ai* ²²² *ai* ²²³ *ai* ²²⁴ *ai* ²²⁵ *ai* ²²⁶ *ai* ²²⁷ *ai* ²²⁸ *ai* ²²⁹ *ai* ²³⁰ *ai* ²³¹ *ai* ²³² *ai* ²³³ *ai* ²³⁴ *ai* ²³⁵ *ai* ²³⁶ *ai* ²³⁷ *ai* ²³⁸ *ai* ²³⁹ *ai* ²⁴⁰ *ai* ²⁴¹ *ai* ²⁴² *ai* ²⁴³ *ai* ²⁴⁴ *ai* ²⁴⁵ *ai* ²⁴⁶ *ai* ²⁴⁷ *ai* ²⁴⁸ *ai* ²⁴⁹ *ai* ²⁵⁰ *ai* ²⁵¹ *ai* ²⁵² *ai* ²⁵³ *ai* ²⁵⁴ *ai* ²⁵⁵ *ai* ²⁵⁶ *ai* ²⁵⁷ *ai* ²⁵⁸ *ai* ²⁵⁹ *ai* ²⁶⁰ *ai* ²⁶¹ *ai* ²⁶² *ai* ²⁶³ *ai* ²⁶⁴ *ai* ²⁶⁵ *ai* ²⁶⁶ *ai* ²⁶⁷ *ai* ²⁶⁸ *ai* ²⁶⁹ *ai* ²⁷⁰ *ai* ²⁷¹ *ai* ²⁷² *ai* ²⁷³ *ai* ²⁷⁴ *ai* ²⁷⁵ *ai* ²⁷⁶ *ai* ²⁷⁷ *ai* ²⁷⁸ *ai* ²⁷⁹ *ai* ²⁸⁰ *ai* ²⁸¹ *ai* ²⁸² *ai* ²⁸³ *ai* ²⁸⁴ *ai* ²⁸⁵ *ai* ²⁸⁶ *ai* ²⁸⁷ *ai* ²⁸⁸ *ai* ²⁸⁹ *ai* ²⁹⁰ *ai* ²⁹¹ *ai* ²⁹² *ai* ²⁹³ *ai* ²⁹⁴ *ai* ²⁹⁵ *ai* ²⁹⁶ *ai* ²⁹⁷ *ai* ²⁹⁸ *ai* ²⁹⁹ *ai* ³⁰⁰ *ai* ³⁰¹ *ai* ³⁰² *ai* ³⁰³ *ai* ³⁰⁴ *ai* ³⁰⁵ *ai* ³⁰⁶ *ai* ³⁰⁷ *ai* ³⁰⁸ *ai* ³⁰⁹ *ai* ³¹⁰ *ai* ³¹¹ *ai* ³¹² *ai* ³¹³ *ai* ³¹⁴ *ai* ³¹⁵ *ai* ³¹⁶ *ai* ³¹⁷ *ai* ³¹⁸ *ai* ³¹⁹ *ai* ³²⁰ *ai* ³²¹ *ai* ³²² *ai* ³²³ *ai* ³²⁴ *ai* ³²⁵ *ai* ³²⁶ *ai* ³²⁷ *ai* ³²⁸ *ai* ³²⁹ *ai* ³³⁰ *ai* ³³¹ *ai* ³³² *ai* ³³³ *ai* ³³⁴ *ai* ³³⁵ *ai* ³³⁶ *ai* ³³⁷ *ai* ³³⁸ *ai* ³³⁹ *ai* ³⁴⁰ *ai* ³⁴¹ *ai* ³⁴² *ai* ³⁴³ *ai* ³⁴⁴ *ai* ³⁴⁵ *ai* ³⁴⁶ *ai* ³⁴⁷ *ai* ³⁴⁸ *ai* ³⁴⁹ *ai* ³⁵⁰ *ai* ³⁵¹ *ai* ³⁵² *ai* ³⁵³ *ai* ³⁵⁴ *ai* ³⁵⁵ *ai* ³⁵⁶ *ai* ³⁵⁷ *ai* ³⁵⁸ *ai* ³⁵⁹ *ai* ³⁶⁰ *ai* ³⁶¹ *ai* ³⁶² *ai* ³⁶³ *ai* ³⁶⁴ *ai* ³⁶⁵ *ai* ³⁶⁶ *ai* ³⁶⁷ *ai* ³⁶⁸ *ai* ³⁶⁹ *ai* ³⁷⁰ *ai* ³⁷¹ *ai* ³⁷² *ai* ³⁷³ *ai* ³⁷⁴ *ai* ³⁷⁵ *ai* ³⁷⁶ *ai* ³⁷⁷ *ai* ³⁷⁸ *ai* ³⁷⁹ *ai* ³⁸⁰ *ai* ³⁸¹ *ai* ³⁸² *ai* ³⁸³ *ai* ³⁸⁴ *ai* ³⁸⁵ *ai* ³⁸⁶ *ai* ³⁸⁷ *ai* ³⁸⁸ *ai* ³⁸⁹ *ai* ³⁹⁰ *ai* ³⁹¹ *ai* ³⁹² *ai* ³⁹³ *ai* ³⁹⁴ *ai* ³⁹⁵ *ai* ³⁹⁶ *ai* ³⁹⁷ *ai* ³⁹⁸ *ai* ³⁹⁹ *ai* ⁴⁰⁰ *ai* ⁴⁰¹ *ai* ⁴⁰² *ai* ⁴⁰³ *ai* ⁴⁰⁴ *ai* ⁴⁰⁵ *ai* ⁴⁰⁶ *ai* ⁴⁰⁷ *ai* ⁴⁰⁸ *ai* ⁴⁰⁹ *ai* ⁴¹⁰ *ai* ⁴¹¹ *ai* ⁴¹² *ai* ⁴¹³ *ai* ⁴¹⁴ *ai* ⁴¹⁵ *ai* ⁴¹⁶ *ai* ⁴¹⁷ *ai* ⁴¹⁸ *ai* ⁴¹⁹ *ai* ⁴²⁰ *ai* ⁴²¹ *ai* ⁴²² *ai* ⁴²³ *ai* ⁴²⁴ *ai* ⁴²⁵ *ai* ⁴²⁶ *ai* ⁴²⁷ *ai* ⁴²⁸ *ai* ⁴²⁹ *ai* ⁴³⁰ *ai* ⁴³¹ *ai* ⁴³² *ai* ⁴³³ *ai* ⁴³⁴ *ai* ⁴³⁵ *ai* ⁴³⁶ *ai* ⁴³⁷ *ai* ⁴³⁸ *ai* ⁴³⁹ *ai* ⁴⁴⁰ *ai* ⁴⁴¹ *ai* ⁴⁴² *ai* ⁴⁴³ *ai* ⁴⁴⁴ *ai* ⁴⁴⁵ *ai* ⁴⁴⁶ *ai* ⁴⁴⁷ *ai* ⁴⁴⁸ *ai* ⁴⁴⁹ *ai* ⁴⁵⁰ *ai* ⁴⁵¹ *ai* ⁴⁵² *ai* ⁴⁵³ *ai* ⁴⁵⁴ *ai* ⁴⁵⁵ *ai* ⁴⁵⁶ *ai* ⁴⁵⁷ *ai* ⁴⁵⁸ *ai* ⁴⁵⁹ *ai* ⁴⁶⁰ *ai* ⁴⁶¹ *ai* ⁴⁶² *ai* ⁴⁶³ *ai* ⁴⁶⁴ *ai* ⁴⁶⁵ *ai* ⁴⁶⁶ *ai* ⁴⁶⁷ *ai* ⁴⁶⁸ *ai* ⁴⁶⁹ *ai* ⁴⁷⁰ *ai* ⁴⁷¹ *ai* ⁴⁷² *ai* ⁴⁷³ *ai* ⁴⁷⁴ *ai* ⁴⁷⁵ *ai* ⁴⁷⁶ *ai* ⁴⁷⁷ *ai* ⁴⁷⁸ *ai* ⁴⁷⁹ *ai* ⁴⁸⁰ *ai* ⁴⁸¹ *ai* ⁴⁸² *ai* ⁴⁸³ *ai* ⁴⁸⁴ *ai* ⁴⁸⁵ *ai* ⁴⁸⁶ *ai* ⁴⁸⁷ *ai* ⁴⁸⁸ *ai* ⁴⁸⁹ *ai* ⁴⁹⁰ *ai* ⁴⁹¹ *ai* ⁴⁹² *ai* ⁴⁹³ *ai* ⁴⁹⁴ *ai* ⁴⁹⁵ *ai* ⁴⁹⁶ *ai* ⁴⁹⁷ *ai* ⁴⁹⁸ *ai* ⁴⁹⁹ *ai* ⁵⁰⁰ *ai* ⁵⁰¹ *ai* ⁵⁰² *ai* ⁵⁰³ *ai* ⁵⁰⁴ *ai* ⁵⁰⁵ *ai* ⁵⁰⁶ *ai* ⁵⁰⁷ *ai* ⁵⁰⁸ *ai* ⁵⁰⁹ *ai* ⁵¹⁰ *ai* ⁵¹¹ *ai* ⁵¹² *ai* ⁵¹³ *ai* ⁵¹⁴ *ai* ⁵¹⁵ *ai* ⁵¹⁶ *ai* ⁵¹⁷ *ai* ⁵¹⁸ *ai* ⁵¹⁹ *ai* ⁵²⁰ *ai* ⁵²¹ *ai* ⁵²² *ai* ⁵²³ *ai* ⁵²⁴ *ai* ⁵²⁵ *ai* ⁵²⁶ *ai* ⁵²⁷ *ai* ⁵²⁸ *ai* ⁵²⁹ *ai* ⁵³⁰ *ai* ⁵³¹ *ai* ⁵³² *ai* ⁵³³ *ai* ⁵³⁴ *ai* ⁵³⁵ *ai* ⁵³⁶ *ai* ⁵³⁷ *ai* ⁵³⁸ *ai* ⁵³⁹ *ai* ⁵⁴⁰ *ai* ⁵⁴¹ *ai* ⁵⁴² *ai* ⁵⁴³ *ai* ⁵⁴⁴ *ai* ⁵⁴⁵ *ai* ⁵⁴⁶ *ai* ⁵⁴⁷ *ai* ⁵⁴⁸ *ai* ⁵⁴⁹ *ai* ⁵⁵⁰ *ai* ⁵⁵¹ *ai* ⁵⁵² *ai* ⁵⁵³ *ai* ⁵⁵⁴ *ai* ⁵⁵⁵ *ai* ⁵⁵⁶ *ai* ⁵⁵⁷ *ai* ⁵⁵⁸ *ai* ⁵⁵⁹ *ai* ⁵⁶⁰ *ai* ⁵⁶¹ *ai* ⁵⁶² *ai* ⁵⁶³ *ai* ⁵⁶⁴ *ai* ⁵⁶⁵ *ai* ⁵⁶⁶ *ai* ⁵⁶⁷ *ai* ⁵⁶⁸ *ai* ⁵⁶⁹ *ai* ⁵⁷⁰ *ai* ⁵⁷¹ *ai* ⁵⁷² *ai* ⁵⁷³ *ai* ⁵⁷⁴ *ai* ⁵⁷⁵ *ai* ⁵⁷⁶ *ai* ⁵⁷⁷ *ai* ⁵⁷⁸ *ai* ⁵⁷⁹ *ai* ⁵⁸⁰ *ai* ⁵⁸¹ *ai* ⁵⁸² *ai* ⁵⁸³ *ai* ⁵⁸⁴ *ai* ⁵⁸⁵ *ai* ⁵⁸⁶ *ai* ⁵⁸⁷ *ai* ⁵⁸⁸ *ai* ⁵⁸⁹ *ai* ⁵⁹⁰ *ai* ⁵⁹¹ *ai* ⁵⁹² *ai* ⁵⁹³ *ai* ⁵⁹⁴ *ai* ⁵⁹⁵ *ai* ⁵⁹⁶ *ai* ⁵⁹⁷ *ai* ⁵⁹⁸ *ai* ⁵⁹⁹ *ai* ⁶⁰⁰ *ai* ⁶⁰¹ *ai* ⁶⁰² *ai* ⁶⁰³ *ai* ⁶⁰⁴ *ai* ⁶⁰⁵ *ai* ⁶⁰⁶ *ai* ⁶⁰⁷ *ai* ⁶⁰⁸ *ai* ⁶⁰⁹ *ai* ⁶¹⁰ *ai* ⁶¹¹ *ai* ⁶¹² *ai* ⁶¹³ *ai* ⁶¹⁴ *ai* ⁶¹⁵ *ai* ⁶¹⁶ *ai* ⁶¹⁷ *ai* ⁶¹⁸ *ai* ⁶¹⁹ *ai* ⁶²⁰ *ai* ⁶²¹ *ai* ⁶²² *ai* ⁶²³ *ai* ⁶²⁴ *ai* ⁶²⁵ *ai* ⁶²⁶ *ai* ⁶²⁷ *ai* ⁶²⁸ *ai* ⁶²⁹ *ai* ⁶³⁰ *ai* ⁶³¹ *ai* ⁶³² *ai* ⁶³³ *ai* ⁶³⁴ *ai* ⁶³⁵ *ai* ⁶³⁶ *ai* ⁶³⁷ *ai* ⁶³⁸ *ai* ⁶³⁹ *ai* ⁶⁴⁰ *ai* ⁶⁴¹ *ai* ⁶⁴² *ai* ⁶⁴³ *ai* ⁶⁴⁴ *ai* ⁶⁴⁵ *ai* ⁶⁴⁶ *ai* ⁶⁴⁷ *ai* ⁶⁴⁸ *ai* ⁶⁴⁹ *ai* ⁶⁵⁰ *ai* ⁶⁵¹ *ai* ⁶⁵² *ai* ⁶⁵³ *ai* ⁶⁵⁴ *ai* ⁶⁵⁵ *ai* ⁶⁵⁶ *ai* ⁶⁵⁷ *ai* ⁶⁵⁸ *ai* ⁶⁵⁹ *ai* ⁶⁶⁰ *ai* ⁶⁶¹ *ai* ⁶⁶² *ai* ⁶⁶³ *ai* ⁶⁶⁴ *ai* ⁶⁶⁵ *ai* ⁶⁶⁶ *ai* ⁶⁶⁷ *ai* ⁶⁶⁸ *ai* ⁶⁶⁹ *ai* ⁶⁷⁰ *ai* ⁶⁷¹ *ai* ⁶⁷² *ai* ⁶⁷³ *ai* ⁶⁷⁴ *ai* ⁶⁷⁵ *ai* ⁶⁷⁶ *ai* ⁶⁷⁷ *ai* ⁶⁷⁸ *ai* ⁶⁷⁹ *ai* ⁶⁸⁰ *ai* ⁶⁸¹ *ai* ⁶⁸² *ai* ⁶⁸³ *ai* ⁶⁸⁴ *ai* ⁶⁸⁵ *ai* ⁶⁸⁶ *ai* ⁶⁸⁷ *ai* ⁶⁸⁸ *ai* ⁶⁸⁹ *ai* ⁶⁹⁰ *ai* ⁶⁹¹ *ai* ⁶⁹² *ai* ⁶⁹³ *ai* ⁶⁹⁴ *ai* ⁶⁹⁵ *ai* ⁶⁹⁶ *ai* ⁶⁹⁷ *ai* ⁶⁹⁸ *ai* ⁶⁹⁹ *ai* ⁷⁰⁰ *ai* ⁷⁰¹ *ai* ⁷⁰² *ai* ⁷⁰³ *ai* ⁷⁰⁴ *ai* ⁷⁰⁵ *ai* ⁷⁰⁶ *ai* ⁷⁰⁷ *ai* ⁷⁰⁸ *ai* ⁷⁰⁹ *ai* ⁷¹⁰ *ai* ⁷¹¹ *ai* ⁷¹² *ai* ⁷¹³ *ai* ⁷¹⁴ *ai* ⁷¹⁵

manner suggested by the rules (literally, 'is expelled to a distance'), and consequently cannot be suspected of being taught here. If, on the other hand, *avasāne*, 'before a pause,' were set by itself, the inquiry would be "what under the sun is it that happens before a pause?" and the expression would appear meaningless. When, however, it is combined with the names of letters that follow, we naturally infer from the association that 'a letter *in pausa*' is intended. Hence, the inclusion of the two precepts in one rule is alone to be approved.

This defense of the unity of the rule is evidently of the most trifling and futile character, and the objectors are in the right—not, indeed, as the separation into two rules is absolutely necessary, but as it is decidedly preferable, and more in accordance with the general usage of the treatise elsewhere.

उष्मा स्वरपरः ॥ १६ ॥

16 Noī a spirant, when followed by a vowel

It is only, of course, after *r* (xiv 4) that a spirant can be liable to duplication before a vowel, so that the combinations to which the rule applies are *rp*, *rsh*, *rs*, and *rh*. All the other treatises excepting the Vāṅ Prat have the same rule (R Pr vi 2, A Pr iii 32, Pan viii 4 49).

The commentator's examples are *daṇḍapārnamāśāu* (ii 2 5⁴ et al), *varshābhyah* (vii 4 13. I presume, my MS of the Sanhitā has *varshyābhyah* twice instead of *varshyābhyah* and *varshābhyah*). O gives instead *suvarshām*, iv 4 4¹, *barsam nahyati* (ii 5 7^{1 2}), and *barhishā* (i 7 4¹ et al. G M have instead *barhisho* 'ham, also i 7 4¹). To illustrate the limitation to a spirant, he gives *ebhir no arkāh* (i e *arkhāh*, iv 4 4⁷. O omits), to show that a vowel must follow, *pārṣve* (i e *pārṣve*, vii 3 10³), *varshyābhyah svāhā* (i e *varshshy-*, vii 4 13. G M omit *svāhā*), *barsvebhīh* (i e *barssv-*, v 7 11), and *agnir hy asya* (i e *hhy*, v 1 5⁵)—but O has a different series, namely *dārgyam yajñam* (iii 2 2³), *varshyebhīh* (the MS has *varshebhīh*, I have not succeeded in finding either word in the Sanhitā), and *agner hy etat purīṣam* (vi 2 8⁶).

The combinations in which the spirant after *r* is doubled, being followed by another consonant, are *rgm*, *rgy*, *rgv*, *rshṭ*, *rshī*, *rshṁ*, *rshy*, *rsv*, and *rhy*. To complete the *sandhi*, either with or without duplication, the rules for insertion of *svanubhakti* (xvi 15, 16) have to be further applied.

16 *svarapara āśmā dvitvaṁ nā* "padyate *svarah paro yas-mād asāu svaraparāh yathā*¹ *durg----* *varsh----* *bar-sam----* *barh-----* ²*rephāt paī am ca* (xiv 4) *iti prāptīh āśhme* 'ti *kum ebhir----* ³*svarapara* *iti* *kum* ⁴*pārṣve varsh- - barsvebhīh agnir- -* ⁵

¹ G M, O om ⁽²⁾ O om ⁽³⁾ O *dā----* *varshebhīh agner--*

प्रथमपरश्च प्लाक्षिप्लाक्षायणयोः ॥ १७ ॥

17 Or, according to Plākshī and Plākshāyana, when followed by a first mute

That is to say, these two *śākhāṇḍu* would leave a spirant free from duplication before an unaspirated surd mute, contrary to the first rule of the chapter. The groups which would be thus affected are *śc* and *ścy*, *śp*, *śh* and *śhy* and *śkr*, *śt* and its further combinations (*śty*, *śtr*, *śtv*), *śp*, *śk*, *śt* and its further combinations (*śtn*, *śty*, *śtr* and *śry*, *śtv*), and *śp*. One hardly sees why combinations with a second mute (namely *śch* and *śchy*, *śkh*, *śth* and *śthy*, *śh* and *śhn*, *śph* and *śphy*) should not be subject to the same rule—but then, one must not expect to see the reason of anything whatever, general rule or particular exception, in this doctrine of duplications. It may be made a question whether the single case, *rsht*, falling under rule 4 is not also here aimed at, if the pair of kinsmen did not overlook it, it is doubtless included with the rest.

The examples (which are lost in W) are *śucandra dāśma* (iv 4 4⁶ O omits *dāśma*) and *aśtāu krtvāḥ* (vi 4 5¹), a counter-example, with a last mute after the spirant, is *tasmād evām viduśhā* (vi 4 9² O omits *viduśhā*), but O has, with B, omitted to point out that this is a counter-example, and gives further, as such, *iśhvā ca vāyena* (v 7 3¹).

The commentator then goes on to say that although the word *ca*, 'or,' in the rule brings down by implication a spirant pure and simple (without exclusion of any sound belonging to that class), yet the real application is only to *ś*, *śh*, *s*, and *h*, since otherwise the mention of *χ* and *φ* in rule 15 would be without meaning, their exception being assured by the present precept. The interpretation is doubtless true, but the reason given for it is only acceptable on the supposition that what is here put forward as the view of two individual authorities is in fact the accepted doctrine of the Prācīnakhyā, in any other case, there is no inconsistency or interference between rules 15 and 17, and the commentator should rather have said that, as the pair of dissidents doubtless accepted

* 17 *plākshīplākshāyanayoh paśhe*¹ *prathamapara śhmad dvitvam nā* *padayate cakāra śhmadnam anvādigaṭi suśc----* *aśtāu----* *prathamapara iti kim* ² *tasmād----* *prathamah paro yasmād asū prathamaparāḥ* ⁴

cakāro *trā*⁵ *yady apy*⁶ *śhmadātrākārśhakas* *tathā* *pr*⁸ *śaśasaheshv eva sampratyayah anyathā*⁹ *vasāne ravīsarjanīya* (xiv 15) *iti*¹⁰ *sātre jhivāmāliyopudhmānīyayor grahanam vyartham anenr*¹¹ *va nishedhasiddheh*¹²

¹ O *mate* ⁽²⁾ W om ³ B O om ⁴ O ins *prathamapara iti kim* *iśhvā* ⁵ G M O om ⁶ W om ⁷ G M *ushmāk* ⁸ W O *hi* ⁹ G M om ¹⁰ W O om ¹¹ O ins *śar* ¹² W O *-shedhe s-*

rule 15, it was not necessary to regard the present statement of their views as having any reference to γ and ϕ . That the rule is accepted in the *śākhā* represented by the commentator may be inferred also from the fact that (under rule 22) he pronounces the five that follow unapproved, but says nothing of this

ऊष्माघोषो हारीतस्य ॥ १८ ॥

18 According to Hārīta, a surd spirant is not doubled

There is unusual variety and inaccuracy of reading among the different manuscripts of the commentary of this rule, and O goes off upon a course of its own yet the aim of all is the same, and not difficult to discover. The word *ūshmā* (which was present or implied in the two preceding rules, and therefore might naturally enough come down into this by continued implication) is here expressly repeated, for the purpose of breaking connection with what goes before. If *aghosha*, 'surd,' only were specified, and *ūshmā*, 'spirant,' implied, the latter would have to be implied along with the attributes attached to it above, namely "followed by a vowel," or "followed by a first mute," and to such a spirant the further qualification of "surd" would be given, while the meaning intended is that Hārīta would forbid the duplication of a surd spirant altogether, in any situation.

O alone gives as first example *dārṣyam yañnam* (ii 2 2³), all have *vāṛṣyo manushyānām* (vii 1 1⁵), to which W B add *pushyati prajāyā paṇubhāh* (ii 4 6²) and *vāṛṣvānarasya rāpam* (v 2 3² et al), which O omits, while G M substitute the single passage *asyā 'parāpam* (ii 5 7³). As counter-example, showing the limitation to a surd spirant, W B give *tv oahmāyā mā* (vii 3 13 B omits *mā*), but G M give instead *mahyam mām* (ii 1 9⁶), and O *sapta jhvdh sapta* (1 5 3²)

18 ¹ *hārītasya* ² *mate* ³ *'ghosha ūshmā dvitvam nā'* ⁴ *'padhyate*
⁵ *'dārṣ-* ---- ⁶ *vāṛṣyo* --- ⁷ *'pushy-* ---- ⁸ *vāṛṣv-* ---- ⁹ *'ayghosha*
iti kum ¹⁰ *'tiro-* --- ¹¹ *ūshmagrahanam* ¹² *pū vasūti anapekshā-*
¹³ *tham* ¹⁴ *atra yady apy ūshmagrahanam na kṛyeta ūshme* ¹⁵ *'ty etat*
¹⁶ *svapararatvena* ¹⁷ *' sambaddham* ¹⁸ *tasmād ihā* ¹⁹ *'pi tatsambaddh-*
²⁰ *syā* ²¹ *'vā* ²² *'ghoshavattvaviśeshah* ²³ *'syāt atas tannivṛttyartham*
²⁴ *ūshmagrahanam* ²⁵ *atra kṛtam* ²⁶ *atah sarvāvastha ūshmā* ²⁷ *'tra*
²⁸ *dvitvamshedhabhāh* ²⁹ *'*

¹ O begins *ūshmagrahanam purvasūti anapekshātham purvasūtre svarapararatvena prathamapararatvena ca sambandha ite aghoshagrahanam tasya 'va viśeshanam* ² *syāt atas tannivṛttyeshu punar ūshmagrahanam har-* etc. ³ O ins *śākhino* ⁴ O *sarvāvastha eva ūshmā 'ghosho nyo na dvivarnam ā*. ⁵ (in O only) ⁶ O om, G M *asyā* ---- ⁷ O simply *sapta* -- ⁸ W *ūshmāyāg*, G M *'mādg-* ⁹ W B *purvatrān-* ¹⁰ G M ins *ca* ¹¹ W *bandham*, B *bandhah* ¹² W B *va* ¹³ W *vāve* ¹⁴ G M *vāve* ¹⁵ W *'ta* ¹⁶ G M *'ghoshatvaviśeshunām* ¹⁷ W B ins *na* ¹⁸ G M *ūshme* ¹⁹ *'tr* ²⁰ W *n shedhayāt*, B *n shedhaya*, and adds, out of place, the first part of the comment to the next rule (to *ephapan o*, excl)

Rules 18-22 are pronounced unapproved under rule 22

रेफपरश्च हकारः ॥ ११ ॥

19 Nor *h*, when followed by *r*

The word *ca* in the rule is declared to continue the implication of "according to Hārīta" This individual having in the former rule limited his denial of duplication to a sibil spirant, and so left the sonant spirant *h* (? the MSS say "a sibil spirant") liable to be always doubled, it is now taught that *h* with the distinctive mark of a following *r* remains single The example given, alike in all MSS, is *duduhre ahrayah* (15 5¹), counter-examples are *juhve* (1 e *juhhve*) *hy agnis tvā* "hvayati (11 12 G M end with *agnih*, W B omit altogether, along with the introductory explanation to the next citation), to show that *h* would be doubled by Hārīta before any other letter than *r*, and *gukram* (1 e *gukkrām*) *te anyat* (1v 1 11² O omits), to show that any other letter than *h* would be doubled before *r*

O, though using two of the citations given by the other MSS, has a wholly independent exposition of this rule

टवर्गश्च तवर्गपरः ॥ २० ॥

20 Nor a lingual mute, when followed by a dental

That is to say, in the opinion of Hārīta Thus, in *vashat te vishno* (11 2 12⁴ O has *vishat te vikshane*, but it is doubtless only a corrupt reading) and *vid dravinam* (18 13¹ et al), Hārīta would leave the groups *tt* and *dd* untouched, while the rules of the treatise would require *ttt* and *ddd*. The other groups in which he would teach the simpler combination are *ttr*, *dd*, *ddh*, and *rtt*, and *ts*, *tsv* and *rts* would fall indirectly under the same exception, since, by v 33, *t* (converted to *th* by 11v 12) must be inserted between *t* and *s* *ts*, then, would in Hārīta's hands become *tths*, in those of the regular adherents of this school, *ttths* Counter-examples, of obvious application, are *vāk te* (1 e *vākh te*, 13 9¹ wanting in B O), *tat te* (13 9¹ et al found in W only, and of no

19 'pūrvam āshma' ghoshu ity ukte' 'ghoshoshmano nityam dvitve prāpte' vīṣiṣhta idānīm' rephaparo hakāraḥ' cakārākṛṣhta-hārītamatē dvitvam nā' padyate yathā' dud-... rephapara iti kim 'juhve-... hakāra iti kim' gukram-... rephah puro yasmād asāu rephaparah

(1) G M a (2) W vīṣiṣhtādānam, B vīṣiṣhtaṣvadanam, G M vīṣiṣhtā id
3 W re 4 G M om (5) W B om

* O substitutes caṣabdo haritasya 'nvadeṣakah haritasya ṣakṛino matē rephaparo hakāro dvivarnam āpadyate dud-... rephapara iti kim juhve-...

20 cakāro' hārītānvādeṣakah' tavargas tavargaparo na dvitvam āpadyate yathā' vashat-... vid-... tavargah paro

account, since exempt from duplication by xiv 23), *shatkapālanī* (1 e *shatīk-*, 185¹ wanting in O), and *vid vāi marutah* (1 e *vidd vāi*, 165³)

लतवर्गो यवकारपरौ ॥ २१ ॥

21 Noi *l* noi a dental mute, when followed by *y* or *v*

Hārīta is this time implied "by vicinage" merely, there being no word in the rule to which his memory can be directly fastened. Examples of *l* before *y* and *v* are *kalyānī* (vii 16⁶) and *bāilvo yāpo bhavati* (ii 18¹ G M omit *bhavati*), of a dental mute in like situation, *kanye 'va tunnā* (iii 111⁸) and *ishe tvā* (i 11 et al). The accepted usage of the school requires *lly*, *llv*, *llyy*, *ltv*, while Hārīta would leave the groups as in the ordinary text.

Combinations of a dental mute with a following *y* or *v* are quite numerous (I have noted about twenty in the Sanhitā)

परश्च ॥ २२ ॥

22 Noi the following

This rule completely puzzles the native comment, which has nothing of any value to say about it. Two explanations are suggested, evidently on the barest conjecture only, and it would be hard to say which of them is the more senseless. In the first place, it is said that *parah*, being singular, implies the sound *v* (as being the one last mentioned in the preceding rule), it, namely, of the two affecting causes (*y* and *v*) specified in rule 21, does not suffer duplication: examples are *māhādātve* (iii 58 et al) and *ā grā-vnah* (vi 32³ W B omit *ā*), and a counter-example, showing the limitation to *v*, is *kalpān juhōti* (v 48⁵). And the intent of the rule is to remove a restriction imposed in rule 3 of this chapter—that is to say, to allow the duplication of *l* before a mute, which is there forbidden. In the second place, *parah* is said to be equivalent to *dvitīya*, 'second,' and to signify that, when the

yasmād asdu tavargaparah tavarga⁷ iti kim⁶ vāk⁸----tat⁹
----⁹ evampara⁸ iti kim⁸ ¹⁰shat----¹⁰ vid----

¹ O *caṣabdo* ² O *tasya 'nv* ³ O *ms hāritasya cākheno mate* ⁴ G M O om
⁽⁶⁾ G M om ⁽⁸⁾ O *tavargapara* ⁷ W *-gapara* ⁽⁹⁾ B om ⁽¹¹⁾ G M om ⁽¹⁰⁾ O om

21 *hārītaḥ sāmudhyāḥ labhyate tanmate latavargāu na khalu yavakāraparāu dvitvam āpnutah¹ yathā lakārah¹ kalyānī bāilvo----² tavarge³ pi² kanye---- ishe---- yavakārānī³ parāu yābhyām tāu tathoktāu⁴*

⁽¹⁾ G M om ⁽²⁾ G M om ³ W B *-ra* ⁴ G M *yavakāraparāu*

My collation of O gives nothing whatever upon rules 21 and 22 and their comment, and I do not know whether there is a *lacuna* in the MS, or whether the collator has overlooked the passage

duplication has been once performed, it is not done over again, as otherwise the process would go on *ad infinitum*. And if it be objected that rule 23 sufficiently forbids this repeated duplication, and that this one would therefore be an unnecessary repetition, the answer is made that that is no fault, since the matter in hand is a division of opinions—that is to say, doubtless, that here Hārīta's view only is concerned, and so there is no necessary connection between the two rules.

Fortunately, the commentator is able to add that the present precept, along with its four predecessors, is to be ruled out of account as unapproved, so that what it means is of very little consequence.

सवर्णसवर्गीयपरः ॥ २३ ॥

23 A letter followed by one homogeneous with itself, or one of the same mute-series, is not duplicated.

By *savarna*, 'of like color or sound,' we are told, is signified identity of form, not merely correspondence as regards place and organ of production. The difference is, that the latter description would apply to the spirants, in their relation to the series of mutes (ii 44, 45), and it is not the usage of this school to exempt the spirants (except *ṣ* and *ḥ*, rule 15) from duplication, even before a mute with which they are akin. The Ath. Pr. (iii 30) does so exempt them. The epithet *savarna*, then, applies only to an identical letter and to the nasal semivowels into which (by v 26, 28) *n* and *m* are converted before *y*, *l*, and *v*.

The cited examples of the application of the rule to homogeneous sounds are *atvakkāya* (vii 5 12²), *attā havīṣṣi* (ii 6 12²), *pippakāte śaravyāyā* (v 5 19 only O has the last word), *samyattāh*

22 *cahāro hārītākarṣhakah¹ para ity ekavacanena² vakāro³ grhyate pūrvasūti asthanimuttayoh⁴ so 'pi⁵ na dvitvam āpadyate yathā v----- ā----- vakāra itī kim kalpān----- sparṣa⁶ evāi 'keśhām ācāryānām (xiv 3) ity 'atrā 'vadhārananirākaraṇāyā⁷ 'yam⁸ ārambhah athavā⁹ taddvutve¹⁰ kṛte pa-go dvitvīyaparyāyo¹¹ dvitvavidhur nā 'sti¹² anavasthāprasaṅgāt nanu savarnasavargīyapara (xiv 23) itī parasūtrenā¹³ 'pi punar dvitvanishedhah¹⁴ 'pāunaruktyam mā bhād itī¹⁵ nata-bhedān nāi 'sha¹⁶ dosha itī brūmah*

hārītamātād¹⁷ āśhmā 'ghoṣha (xiv 18) ityādisūtrapañcakam¹⁸ anishtam

¹ G M -*tamatā-* ² W *eva v* ³ W *sav-*, and puts after *grhyate* ⁴ G M ins *parah* ⁵ G M ins *hārītamāte* ⁶ G M -*ṣapa-* ⁷ G M *evandhā nāyāyā* ⁸ 'yam ⁹ W B *yathā* ¹⁰ G M om *tad* ¹¹ G M *āyena* ¹² G M *dhm na prap not* ¹³ W om *para* ¹⁴ G M ins *tasmāt* ¹⁵ W *kṛtyo mā bhavati*, G M -*kṛtyam āvāhati* ¹⁶ W *va* ¹⁷ G M -*mate* ¹⁸ G M *ityādi pa a ṣ ce 'tyantam sū* O wanting (see above)

(15 1¹ et al wanting in W B), *yal lohutam* (11 7²), and *tvam vā-tār ununāh* (13 14¹ only O has *arunāh*) Those which illustrate absence of duplication of a mute before another of the same series are *aiñkāu nyāñkāu* (17 7²), *piññcam upa* (v 2 7³ O omits *upa*), *kāñdāt-kāñdāt* (iv 2 9² et al), *tam te duççakshāh* (11 2 10²), and *ambha stha* (15 6¹ et al) Then the commentator quotes from some unnamed authority a verse prescribing that "when a nasal precedes, a *k* or *g* is inserted before *t* or *dh* respectively," and claims that, in virtue of it, there fall under the rule also such cases as *pāñkto yayñah pāñktāh* (15 2¹ et al G M O omit the last word) and *tān brāyād yuñgdhwam it* (11 4 8² O omits the first two words) From this we should draw the inference that, in forms like those here quoted, the omission of the non-nasal mute (specially prescribed by the Ath Pr, at 11 20) is the regular and proper reading of the *çāhhā*, its presence, when found, being regarded as an irregular insertion, or a process forming part of the *varṇakrama*—which is just the opposite of the etymologically correct view I have not collected all the passages illustrating the point, but the omission is certainly the prevailing, though not exclusive, reading in my manuscript of the Sanhita, as also in the Calcutta edition That the verse quoted is from some treatise dealing specifically with the Tāttirīya text may be inferred (not too confidently) from its making no mention of *th* as requiring the insertion of *k*, it being the fact that no example of *th* in such a situation is to be found in the Sanhitā

Finally, as counter-examples, where the two mutes are of different classes, we receive (except in O) *vāñ ma āsan* (v 5 9² G M end with *me*), *shan māsaḥ* (vi 5 3⁴), *vidūthāni manmahe* (iv 7 15³), and *dāmna⁵ pāu⁶ mbhan* (11 4 13 W B have *dāmna* only) here the combinations are to be made *ñm*, *mm*, *nm*, and *mn* The illustrations are quite one-sided, both for and against the rule, being only groups containing a nasal

This rule furnishes the most important of all the prescribed

23 *savarnaparāḥ savargīyaparaḥ ca dvitvam nā⁷ padyate savarnatvam nāma sārūpyam¹ ucyate na tulyasthānuhakaranatāmātram savargīyah samānavargasambandhī yathā atvahlāya attā---- pipp---- samyattīh² yal---- tvam---- savarnaparāṇy evamādāni savargīyaparāṇy³ api⁴ vaddmah añhāu-- - piññcam---- kāñdāt-- . tam-- - ambha----*

anunāsikapūrvas⁵ tu kakāro madhya⁶ āgamah gakkāḥ ca takāre⁷ ca⁸ dhakāna ca⁹ yathākramam itivacanād¹⁰ idam apy uddharanam pāñkto---- tān----⁹ evampara ite kun vāñ---- shan---- vīda---- dāmna¹¹----

¹ B -pyatvam ² W B om ³ W savarnap ⁴ W eva ⁵ W anusvārap-
⁶ W -dhīyamā ⁷ O raç ⁸ W om, G M yal ⁹ O om

restrictions to the sphere of duplication, as there are somewhat over a hundred consonant groups to which it applies

नानुत्तम उत्तमपरः ॥ २४ ॥

24 Unless, indeed, it be a non-nasal followed by a nasal

This is a precept of counter-exception, contravening in part the exceptions established by the foregoing rule. Examples are *yācñā* (i 5 7⁴ the only example of this combination which the text affords), *yayñe-yayñe* (ii 1 11² but O has *yayñena*, vi 5 3¹ et al), *ātnārah* (v 6 5³ also the sole instance), *sa pratnuvat* (ii 2 12¹ et al in O only), and *pāpmanam* (i 4 41 et al) a counter-example is *tam mā devāh* (ii 3 2² wanting in O)

The cases here denied exemption from duplication are those in which, according to xxi 12, *yama* is introduced between the two mutes. According to the Vāj Prāt (iv 111), *yama* suspends duplication

अथैकेषामाचार्याणाम् ॥ २५ ॥

25 Now for the views of certain teachers

A simple heading for the rules that follow, in force as far as rule 28 inclusive—or, according to the commentator's interpretation of rule 28, through 27 only

लकारो ह्रस्वकारपरः ॥ २६ ॥

26 A *l* is not doubled when followed by *h*, *ç*, or *v*

The commentator's examples are *malhā ā'labhanta* (ii 1 2⁴ but B O have *-bheta*, which is found in the same division, and G M read *-bhate*, which is doubtless a corruption of the same), *catavalgo vi roha* (i 3 5 and vi 3 3³ O omits *vi roha*), and *tato bīvah* (ii 1 8² O substitutes *bālvō yāpah*, ii 1 8¹), his counter-examples (omitted in O) are *kalmāshī* (v 1 1⁴) and *kalyānī* (vii 1 6⁶)

This rule, we are told, determines the usage of the school so far as the combinations *lh* and *lç* are concerned, but not in the case of

24 *nakāro 'yam pratiprasavārthah'*, ²*uttamaparo 'nuttamo divitvam āpadyate yathā'* *yācñā yaj----* *ātnārah 'sa----* ⁴*pāpmanam 'anuttama uttamapara iti kim tam----* ⁵*uttamah paro yasmād asāv'* *uttamaparah savarnasavargīyapara'* (xiv 23) *iti pratishedhaprāptāv ayam ārambhah*

¹ O *pravārtha* ² G M om ³ O om ⁴ in O only ⁵ O om, B om *anuttama*, W om *uttama* ⁶ G M om *para*

25 *athe 'ty ayam adhikārah ekeshām 'mate' kryata' ity etad adhikrtam veditavyam ita uttaram yad vakshyāmah*

¹ G M ms *ādityānam* ² G M *matam*, O *maçitam* ³ G M O *adhikri-*

lv But O has an inserted passage, so corrupted as to be hardly intelligible, which quotes a verse (easily made such by a little emendation) from some authority unspecified, making a distinction between *lv* as occurring in a circumflexed syllable or otherwise—that is to say, between *bilvāh* and *bālvāh*

All the groups here treated of are quite rare, *lç* occurring, I believe, only in *valça* (vii 3 19) and its compounds, and *lv* only in *malha*, *lv* is sometimes found also as the result of *sandhi* (as at 15 9⁶ 11 5 1⁶)

The commentator adds, finally, that the next rule also is not approved

स्पर्श स्पर्शपरः ॥ २७ ॥

27 Nor a mute that is followed by a mute

This is a view of certain authorities merely, and unapproved. The examples are *vāg devī* (17 10²), *apām oymānam* (iv 6 8⁶), *ātnārah* (v 6 5³), *sa pratnavat* (11 2 12¹ et al), and *yum apnavānah* (15 5¹) O has only the first two of them

पदान्तश्च व्यञ्जनपरः प्राकृतः ॥ २८ ॥

28 Nor an original final that is followed by a consonant

The natural meaning of this rule would appear to be simply that, in the opinion of some authorities, a final mute which is not the product of euphonic alteration is exempted from duplication before any initial consonant whatever (not before a mute only, as in the preceding rule). The commentator, however, manages to extract from it a very different value—namely, that *n* final is not liable to duplication before a semivowel or spirant (1 e *h*), and he regards

26 ¹ ekeshām ² mate haçavakāraparo lakāro³ dvitvam nā
"padyate malhā---- çata---- tato---- ⁴evampara itī
kim kalmāshī ⁵kalyānī⁶ hakāraç ca çakāraç ca vakāraç
ca haçavakārāh ⁷te⁸ pare yasmāt sa tathoktah

atra⁹ haçapare kāryam iṣṭam¹⁰ na tu vakārapare ¹¹nā¹² pi pa-
rasūtram¹³ iṣṭam

¹ G M ins sa ² G M O ms ācaryānam ³ G M lavakāra ⁴ O om ⁵ W om ⁶ O ete ⁷ G M O om ⁸ O ms lakarasya haçavakārapara itī sūtre sthatah
kim karanam nam vakāra itī prayoganam asti lakaravakarasya samyoga svarito
yadā tadā samyukta eva syad asamyukta tadanyathā itī vacanum asti tasmāt ku-
ranāt yadā lakaravakārapara itī tato bilvāh ⁹ O sūtram

27 ekeshām ¹ mate sparçaparū sparçō² dvitvam nā "padyate³
vāg---- āpām---- ⁴ātnārah sa---- yam---- ⁵ sparçah
paro yasmād asū sparçaparah

¹ O ins ācaryanam ² O puts next after mate ³ O na dvitvam āpnoti ⁴ O om

this as the accepted doctrine of the school, and as determining the reading in this *śūkhā*. How this strange result is arrived at, we have to follow through his lengthy exposition closely enough to discover

In the first place, *vyāñjanapara*, 'followed by a consonant,' is declared to mean 'followed by any other consonant than a mute,' because otherwise, as we have read 'followed by a mute' in the preceding rule, the treatise would be guilty of a needless repetition so far as sequence by a mute is concerned. To this the natural answer would be that the two rules do not come into collision, since they do not occupy the same ground: the former relates to any mute in any situation, the latter only to an unaltered mute at the end of a word, and if the one is declared to have a single pronunciation before a mute only, the other before any consonant whatever, what objection can possibly be taken? Moreover, we are stating here the views of certain authorities, of whom one set might hold rule 27, and the other rule 28: and even if they partly covered one another, there would be nothing wrong about it. Once more, *sparṣapara* is claimed to be implied here merely for the purpose of denying it, the commentator's conclusion being that there is duplication of *n* before a mute, though not before a semi-vowel, and that is certainly a very remarkable kind of *anuvṛtti* which should work thus by contraries. Of the last two considerations, the commentator takes no notice (although he has once appealed to the former of them in a somewhat similar case above, under rule 22) the first he states and replies to. It may be objected, he says, that there is a difference of affecting cause laid down in consequence of the difference of the affected letter, the latter is here qualified as final and as original, and the former as being any consonant whatever. Nevertheless, he claims, there would be meaninglessness of the qualification of the affecting cause,

28 *vyāñjanapara* iti *sparṣa* śavayati¹ ictur² *vyāñjanapara* ity³ arthah
anyathā *sparṣānām* api *grahane* pūrvasūtr⁴ 'pi *sparṣa*¹ ity³ ukta-
tvāt pūrvaniruktyam syāt⁵ nanu *nimittaviśeṣān*² *nimittaviśeṣo*³
'*stī* *padāntatvam* prākṛtatvam⁴ ca *nimittino*⁴ *viśeṣā*² *nimittasya*
tu *sarvavyāñjanātma*katvam⁵ ity³ cet⁶ tathā⁷ 'pi *sparṣabhāge* *ni-*
*mittaviśeṣasya*⁸ *vānyarthyun*⁹ *sparṣapara* ity³ ¹⁰*atra* *sādhānyend*
'*pi*¹⁰ *nimittaviśeṣasya*¹¹ *vigatati*¹² tasmād¹³ *antasthāditya* *evā*
'*tra* *vyāñjanapad*deno¹⁴ 'cyante¹⁵ ¹⁶*cahāro* *yady* *api* *sparṣamātrā-*
*karshuka*s¹⁶ tathā¹⁷ 'pi *pārvic*eshyān¹⁴ ¹⁸*nukārasya* *'nukāra*shanam¹⁵
tathā¹⁹ hi *antasthāditya*ñjanaparato²⁰ 'nyu²¹ *sparṣānām*¹⁸ *avikṛtā-*
nām *padānte* *sthitur* nā²² 'stī²³ *sa*m²⁴ *rād* ity³ *atrā* 'stī²⁵ 'ti²⁶ *cet* *mā-*
'vam *na* *sañ* *sām* ity³ ²⁷*rāpa*ra²⁸ (xiii 4) ity³ *atra* *vānyarthya*t²⁹
viśabdo *makā*rya³⁰ *dvitvasadbhāvam* *bodhayati* 'ty³¹ ³²*adhyaya*nā-
nurodhād *upapādita*m³³ *tasmān* *nā* 'sha³⁴ *nished*havishayah³⁵ ³⁶*nā*
'pi *brahma*n³⁷ *vantah* *nyañ*.... ity³⁸ *āditya*viśayah³⁹ ⁴⁰*kutah* *iha*

so far as mutes were concerned the reason he gives is of course a mere quibble, and the point of it is so fine that I am not confident of seeing it rightly it seems to be, that there is an absence of such qualification in the implied term *sparsapara*. At any rate, the comfortable conclusion is, that only the semivowels etc are intended by the term "consonant" as employed in the rule. The next step is, to declare that *ca*, 'nor,' although it strictly brings forward 'a mute,' without qualification, yet really amounts, on the principle of exclusion, to an implication of *n* only. Namely, thus no other consonant remains unchanged at the end of a word before a semivowel or spirant. It may be objected that *n* also does so before *r* (by xiii 4) in such words as *samrāṇ* but this is of no account, for, if admitted as a reproach to the interpretation now under treatment, it would convict of superfluosity a part of rule xiii 4, namely, the *iti*, which was shown, in accordance with the received reading of the *śākhā*, to teach the duplication of the *m*. We see now why that atrociously forced and groundless construction of the meaning of rule xiii 4 was made, it was needed to bolster up in advance the forced and groundless construction to be put upon the present precept. As the *m*, then, constitutes no ground of exception, so neither do the nasals *n* and *ñ* in such cases as *brahmanvantah* (vi 4 10¹) and *nyāñ raṣmibhūh* (ii 4 10²). For why? the qualification *prākṛta*, 'original,' in the rule involves [as belonging to the letter to which it is applied] the quality of being alterable, since it would otherwise be meaningless, and there is no case to be found where either *n* or *ñ* is altered before a semivowel or spirant. If, then, the term *prākṛta* is to be allowed its proper force, the implication of any other mute than *n* must be excluded. Here is another most arbitrary act of construction—as if *prākṛta* meant necessarily '(an alterable mute) when it retains its original form,' instead of simply '(a mute) that retains its original form.'

*prākṛta iti viśeṣhanam vikrtasadbhāvam*²¹ *kalpayati* ²²*anyathā svasya*²³ *vānyarthyāt tac ca vikrtatvam nakārasya*²⁴ *nakārasya*²⁵ *vā 'ntasthādiparatve*²⁶ *sūti kvacid api padānte na dr̥ṣyate tasmāt prākṛta iti*²⁷ *prayogaśaphalyāya*²⁷ *nakārasyār 'vā 'nukarshanam yuktam iti pāreṣhyam*

*kim ca māhishēye 'pi nakārasyār 'vā 'nukarshanam siddhivatikṛtyo*²⁸ *'ktam* ²⁹*tatre 'yam sūtrayogand*²⁹ *ekeshām* ³⁰*mate padāntah prākṛto nakāro 'ntasthādīvyāñyanaparo*³¹ *na dvitvam āpadyate yathā mitro---- om---- etān---- padānta iti kim anyā---- anv---- antasthādīpura iti kim tān---- imān---- prākṛta iti kim tān----* ³²*vāśh----* ³²*namu katham atra*³³ *vikrtatvam*

*rephād rvarnāt*³⁴ *pārvaḥ ca tavargāc*³⁵ *ca paraḥ ca na*³⁶ *tavargasthāna*³⁷ *ity āhur ataststhāno*³⁸ *'nya*³⁹ *ucyate* *iti vacandāsti sthānabhede*⁴⁰ *kṛtam*⁴¹ *vikrtatvam* ⁴²*iti brāmah.*

The authority of Māhīśheya (see note to the introductory verses, p 7) is further appealed to as making the same restriction of implication. His explanation is that, in the view of some teachers, a final unaltered *n* followed by a semivowel or spirant is not doubled. Examples are *mitro jānān yātīyati* (ii 4 11⁵ only G M have *mitro*), *omanī atī te* (ii 6 9⁵, p *oman-vatī*), and *etān homān* (i 5 4⁴), in all which we are to understand that the *n* remains single. On the other hand, there is duplication in *anyā* (i e *annya*) *yantrī* (ii 5 12²) and *anv* (i e *annv*) *aha māśāh* (i 7 13¹), where the *n* is not final, in *tān* (i e *tānn*) *kālpayati* (v 3 1²) and *imān* (i e *imānn*) *bhadrān* (i 6 3¹), where the *n* is followed by a mute, and also in *tān rakṣadhvam* (i 2 7) and *vāṣṇavān rakshohanah* (i 3 2²), where, it is asserted, the *n* does not maintain its original form. Since, however, there is no rule in the Prātiçākhyā for altering a *n* in this last pair of cases, the commentator quotes (from the same authority, we may conjecture, which has been recently twice appealed to, under rules 23 and 26) a prescription to the effect that *n* when preceding a *r* or an *r*-vowel, or when following a lingual (the MSS say, a dental) mute, is uttered in the lingual position: thus, he says, in virtue of its change of position, the *n* is phonetically altered. Finally, he makes an alleged citation from the Çikshā (not found in the version known to us), which teaches that a final *n* preceding *r* exhibits a peculiarity, and is liable to duplication. Such a modification of the utterance of *n* forms no part of the phonetic system of any of the Prātiçākhyās.

Thus is brought to an end the tedious subject of duplication, the physical foundation of which is of the obscurest, although the pains with which the Hindu *çākhināḥ* have elaborated it, and the earnestness with which they assert their discordant views respecting it, prove that it had for them a real, or what seemed like a real, value.

çikshā cār 'vam vakshyati

⁴³ *rephāt pūrvo*⁴³ *nukāro yuh padānte*⁴⁴ *yatra*¹⁵ *drçyate*

*vijesham tatra jānīyād dvitvam ity*⁴⁵ *abhidhīyate*

⁴⁷ *vyāñjanam asmāt* ⁴⁸ *param iti*⁴⁸ *vyāñjanapūṇah prakṛtiḥ*⁴⁹
svalbhāvuh tatsambandhī prakṛtaḥ

¹ O *çapara* ² G M *tianāçun*, O *-tīanmittav* ⁴ G M *viçīsto 'py ariho*,
O *namitkaviçesho 'py a* ⁴ G M *tto* ⁵ G M O *shah* ⁶ G M *-kam* ⁷ G M
-çaviñh- ⁸ G M *çāste 'sya* ⁹ O *rthye* ⁽¹⁰⁾ O *avyāñjanasāmānye*, G M om
api ¹¹ G M *syā*, O *-sha* ¹² G M *'pi g*, O *pag-* ¹³ O om ⁽¹⁴⁾ W B *cakura*
spañçuksharapuri-, G M *cakurasthūnaspāçakāh shakah pañçeshyan* ⁽¹⁵⁾ B *takara-*
kanṣhanam ¹⁶ G M O *saty any* ¹⁷ G M *ins tu* ¹⁸ G M om ¹⁹ W om *iti*
⁽²⁰⁾ W om ²¹ W *-ave* ²² G M om ²³ B *svarasya* ²⁴ W B *nah* ²⁵ W *dak-*,
B om ²⁶ O *divyāñjanop* ²⁷ W *çakal* ²⁸ O *dāhev* ⁽²⁹⁾ O om, B G M
tatrāç 'vam s-, G M *tre yo* ³⁰ O *ins acuryānam* ³¹ W *sthavy* ⁽³²⁾ O om
³³ W *a* ³⁴ W O *av*, B *v-*, G M *rav-* ³⁵ all the MSS *tav* ³⁶ G M *na*
³⁷ W B O *tav* ³⁸ W O *ata sth-*, G M *asthūne* ³⁹ G M om ⁴⁰ O *da*, G
M *-dāt* ⁴¹ G M om ⁴² O *ins asti* ⁽⁴³⁾ all but O *rephap* ⁴⁴ W G *to* ⁴⁵ G
M *yadī* ⁴⁶ B om ⁴⁷ O *ins cakuro kanasyarçakarshakah* ⁽⁴⁸⁾ W *paro* ⁴⁹ G
M O *tr it*

उदात्तात्परो ऽनुदात्तः स्वरितम् ॥ २९ ॥

29 A grave following an acute becomes circumflex

The following rule shows that the substantive here to be understood is *svarah*, 'vowel'. All the other Prātiśākhya, in their corresponding rules (R Pr iii 9, V Pr iv 134, A Pr iii 67), state the principle as applying to an *akṣaram*, 'syllable'. In his explanation and illustration, however, the commentator is not careful to bear this in mind. He states the sphere of the rule to be all the three kinds of enclitic circumflex, the *prātihatu* (xx 3), *pādavrtta* (xx 6), and *tārovyañjana* (xx 7), although these in part include cases to which only the next rule attributes the circumflexed quality. And his examples are *sā idhānāh* (iv 4 4⁵), *āthā 'bravit* (iii 2 11²), *vāsvy asi* (i 2 5¹ et al), *prāugam* (iv 4 2¹), and *tāyā devātayā* (iv 2 9² et al), of which only the first and fourth show the circumflex vowel following the acute without an intervening consonant (rule 30). Not all are all the examples unexceptionable in other respects, for though the *i* of *idhānāh* and the *a* of *asi* are really *anudatta*, 'grave,' in the *pada*-text, and so show an actual conversion into circumflex, the other exhibited cases of enclitic circumflex are circumflexed in the *pada*-text as well, and undergo no alteration in consequence of their change to *samhitā*. It is at this that the commentator aims, when he adds that, "there being grave quality in the condition of separation of letters, then, when these are combined together, circumflex quality appears in accordance with the present precept." That is to say, it is the natural unaccented quality of the syllable that is here implied in *anudatta*, not its being technically grave, and marked as such. This understanding is also needed in order to make good rule 31, where we are not taught that the enclitically circumflexed final of *ātha*, for example, becomes grave before an acute or circumflex (as in *ātha tvām*, *ātha kvā*), but that the unaccented final *a*, which was made circumflex by rules 29 and 30 after *ā*, is exempted from the change when so followed, and remains unaccented.

The enclitic circumflex is written in the recorded Tāttirīya text in the same manner as in the Rik and Atharvan, namely, by the perpendicular stroke above the syllable, the same that is used for the independent circumflex. The method is so familiar to all students of the Veda that it does not need to be illustrated here. Certain specialties of Tāttirīya usage will come up for notice under later rules (xiv 3, xxi 10, 11).

29 *prātihatapādavrttatārovyañjanavishayam*¹ *etut* • *udāttāt paro 'nudāttah svaritam āpadyate yathā sa.... athā.... vāsvy... pra.... tayā.... varnavibhāgāvasthādyām anudāttatve saty 'eva punas tatsamhitādyām*² *eva*³ *tallakshanasvaritavām* *prāugam* *vyādhā vyñeyam*

¹ O om *padaavrtta*, and ins *prāvṛtta* before *vish* ² W *evā 'dhasatā sam-*

For an exposition of the place and value of the enclitic circumflex in the Hindu accentual system, see the note to Ath Pr iii 65. It may doubtless admit of question whether the Hindu phonetists, in noting the syllable naturally grave as being otherwise than grave when immediately preceded by an acute, would not have apprehended it better, and described it more truly, as a middle tone between acute and grave, rather than a combination (140) of acute and grave. Arguments drawn from the analogies of the Greek and Latin accentual systems (see F. Mistel, in Kuhn's *Zeitschrift*, vol. xvii, 1868, also Prof J. Hadley, in the Proceedings of the Am. Oriental Society for Oct. 1869 [Journal, vol. ix, pp. lxii-lxiii]) may press upon us this latter view as the more plausible. But that any one having access to the sources of knowledge upon the subject should dispute the substantial identity in physical character of the Greek circumflex and the Sanskrit independent *svarita*, and should set down the latter as a "middle tone," in the face of all authority and of all sound phonetic theory, savours of inexcusable carelessness or prejudice.

व्यञ्जनान्तरहितो ऽपि ॥ ३० ॥

30 Even when consonants intervene

For the necessity of this explicit statement, see the note on the preceding rule. The commentator, having already given under the latter several cases in which the affected and the affecting vowel were separated by one or more consonants, has nothing that is new to offer, but he quotes, nevertheless, *tād agne anrnō bhavāmi* (iii 3 8² B O om *bhavāmi*) and *yās tvā hrādī* (i 4 46¹) in the first case, *ag-* and *bha-* are circumflexed, in the second, *tvā*

नोदात्तस्वरितपरः ॥ ३१ ॥

31 Not, however, when an acute or circumflex follows

That is to say, the syllable naturally unaccented or grave—but which, coming next after an acute, would usually take, by rule 29, the tone of transition from higher to lower pitch—retains its low or grave tone if immediately followed by an acute, or by a (*nitya* or independent, of course) circumflex, of which the first element is acute: the pitch of voice is governed by the following tone in preference to the preceding, and sinks at once, without perceptible movement of transfer, to the level of *anudātta*, as a vantage-ground from which to rise to the immediately succeeding high point.

In this rule, as well as that to which it constitutes an exception,

30 *vyañjanāntarhito*¹ 'py *udātāt paro* 'nudātāt *svaritam*²
*āpadyate yathā*³ *tad----* *yas----* 'ity ādi' *antarhito vya-*
vahita ity arthah

¹ O *ant-* ² B *atvam* ³ G M om ⁴ O om

all authorities are agreed (see note to Ath Pr iii 70), although we should not less naturally expect the double attraction, of a high tone on either hand, to exercise at least as much assimilating effect upon the pitch of an intermediate syllable as a preceding high tone alone exerts

The commentators' examples are *sá mām lokām* (1 5 9⁴ but G M add *ayān*, which doubtless means *tā mām lokām ayān*, vii 1 5³), *tāsmāt tā ādyā annadhānāt* (vii 1 1⁵ only O has the first word and the last), *kīrīnā mānyamānūh* (1 4 46¹), and *tāsyā vy'ādham āndām ayāyatu* (vi 5 6¹ only G M have the last two words) the vowels between acute and acute, or between acute and circumflex, in these examples, are *anudatta*, and written, as such, with the horizontal stroke beneath

The three rules here given only apply, in strictness, to a single unaccented syllable following an acute, where there is more than one such, the rules for *prācaya* (xxi 10,11) come into force

नाग्निवेश्यायनस्य ॥ ३२ ॥

32 Not so, according to Āgniveṣyāyana

The significance of this rule (which is declared unapproved, in the comment to its successor) is more clearly stated by O, in an independent exposition, than by the other four versions of the comment. It is meant to exhibit an opinion contravening the doctrine laid down by its predecessor, and allowing the circumflex accent to stand, even when the following syllable has, or begins with, the high tone. No examples are given, except by O, which has *vōdhavē* (1 6 2¹ et al) and *tāsya kvā suvargāh* (ii 6 5⁵)

G M read, in rule and comment, Āgnivāṣyāyana

सर्वी नेत्येके सर्वी नेत्येके ॥ ३३ ॥

33 Some say not, in all cases

31 *udāttasvaritapara' udāttāt paro 'nudātto na' svaritam āpadyate' yathā' sa---- tas---- kīi ---- tasyāi----*
udāttaḥ ca svaritaḥ co 'dāttasvaritāu tāu parāu yasmāt sa tatho 'ktah

¹ W *paro nān*, B *svaritaparo va*, G M *udāttapara svaritaparo vā*, O *do*, except *va* ² G M O put after *svaritam* ³ B *āpnōti*, O *pāpnōti* ⁴ G M *om*

32 *pārvasūti apratiprasavārtho' 'yām nukārah udāttāt paro 'nudāttah svaritam' āgniveṣyāyanasya' mata udāttuparo' vā' svaritaparo vā ' nā 'padyata iti na' pārvoktāny evo 'dāhananān*

¹ B *-trasya prāti-* ² G M *om* ³ G M *yana* ⁴ W B G M *itāt pa* ⁵ B *'nudātta*, G M *om* ⁶ B G M *ins svaritam* ⁷ B *om*

O substitutes *agniveṣyāyanasya* (dīkṣīno mate *udattarapara svaritaparo vā udāttāt paro 'nudātta svaritam āpadyate na pratishedhah yathā vō---- tas----*

According to the majority of MSS of the comment, the denial of these skeptical people is not limited to the enclitic *svarita*, but extends to the whole accent, in all its seven forms (xx 1-8). Thus, namely, in the *brāhmana* of the Vājasaneyins (that is to say, the Çatapatha-Brahmana) there are only two accents, the acute and the grave. But O has once more a version of its own, stating that the authorities here referred to would not, like Âgnivegyāvana, annul rule 31 simply, but would also deny the rules in general for the enclitic circumflex, as in *sá udhānāh* (iv 4 4⁵) and *prapā'* (? MS *pruthā*) *asi* (ii 5 12⁴). We cannot well hesitate to prefer the latter interpretation, there has been no question here of the independent circumflex, and a denial of its existence would be altogether out of place and impertinent. Nor is the reference to the Çatapatha-Brahmana one at all likely to have been intended by the Prātiçākhyā. And it is not true, except so far as the mode of designating the accents is concerned, that that treatise has no circumflex accent: it writes, to be sure, only the *anudatta* sign, so that, if the value of this were the same as in the other usual systems of designation, all its syllables would be either grave or acute: and on this foundation, later Hindu systematists have declared them such, and painfully elaborated an exposition of them (see Weber's *Ind. Studien*, x 397 ff).

Rules 32 and 33 are, naturally enough, declared unapproved, but to us it is both interesting and important to find that there were Hindu phonetists in the ancient time who did not admit such an element of utterance as the enclitic circumflex.

CHAPTER XV

CONTENTS 1-3 nasalization of vowels, or insertion of *anusvāra*, in cases of the loss or alteration of *n* or *m*, 4-5, the same, in the cases detailed in the next chapter, 6-8, the same, in the case of certain finals, 9, utterance in monotone

33 *na kevalam udattāt paraḥ kim tu sarva eva saptavidha-svarito nā'sti 'ty eke śākhino manyante tathā hi vājasaneyi-brāhmane' dvāu eva svarāu udattaś cā'nudattaś ca ne'dam sūtradvayani² iṣṭam*

O substitutes eke śākhino manyante na kevalanudattāḥ udattassurītiaparah *prati-śedhyati kim tai hi udattakapurvakaś ca sa... prathā.... ne'dam* etc

*iti tribhāshyaṁ atne prātiśākhyaavivarane
caturdaśo³ dhyāyah*

¹ W *vājaneyabrā*, B *nehabr*-, G M *neyabr*- ² W *-tram* ³ G M O *dvitrye prapne dvitrye*

नकारस्य रेफोष्मयकारभावाज्जुते च मलोपाच्च पूर्वस्वरो ऽनुनासिकः ॥ १ ॥

1 In case of the conversion of *n* into *r*, a spirant, or *y*—also when the *y* is omitted—or in case of the omission of *m*, the preceding vowel becomes nasal

That this Prāṭiśākhya takes no distinct and consistent ground upon the question whether the so called *anusvāra* consists in a nasalization of the vowel or in a nasal consonantal element following the vowel, has been already pointed out (note to ii 30), as also, that the present rule is the one where the former view is most unequivocally taken. As the school to which the commentator belongs has adopted the other view, he declares (under rule 2) that the doctrine here laid down is unapproved.

The “conversion of *n* into *r* or a spirant” is, of course, the retention of a historical final *s* after *n* unchanged before *t* (vi 14), or changed to *ç* before *c* (v 20), or to *r* before a vowel (ix 20 etc.), its “conversion into *y*,” with the (invariably) consequent “loss of the *y*” (ix 20 etc., x 19), goes back to the same cause. The commentator’s illustrative examples are *agnīṅr apsuśudāḥ* (v 6 1²), *sa trīṅr ekādaśāṅr iha* (iii 2 11³ found in O only), *kurnāṅç cā ’kurnāṅç ca* (i 8 9³), *trīṅs troān* (ii 5 10¹), and *mahāṅr indrah* (i 4 20 et al), of which the last is by part of the MSS, rather needlessly, quoted twice, once for the conversion of the *n* into *y* (for which it should be written *mahāṅy indrah*), and again for the loss of the *y*. For the loss of *m* (by xii 2), the examples are *pratyushtaṅ rakshaḥ* (i 1 2¹ et al) and *saṅgitam me* (iv 1 10³ et al).

The commentator explains *anundāsika* by *sānundāsika*, as if the word were properly a noun, and needed reduction to adjective form. In this treatise, however, it is always and only an adjective, meaning ‘nasal’ (see note to ii 30).

नैकेषाम् ॥ २ ॥

2 Some deny this

1 ‘*nakārasya rephabhāvad ūshmabhāvad yakārabhāvāc cakā-
rākrshtayakāre hupte ca*² *sati ’makāralopāc ca*³ *pārvāsvaro ’nunā-
siko*¹ *bhavati sānundāsiko bhavati*⁴ *’ty arthah*⁵ *’yathā rephabhā-
vāt*⁶ *agn- ---*⁷ *’sa- ---*⁸ *’atho*⁹ *’śmabhāvad*¹⁰ *karn- ---*
*trīṅs- ---*¹¹ *’yakārabhāvad yathā*¹² *mahāṅr- ---*¹³ *’yakāre hupte*
*yathā*¹⁴ *mahāṅr- ---*¹⁵ *’atha makāralopāt*¹⁶ *praty- ---*¹⁷ *saṅ-*
*-----*¹⁸ *’ty ādi*¹⁹ *nakārasya lopo makāralopah*²⁰ *tasmāt*

(¹) wanting in B (²) O om (³) W om (⁴) O om (⁵) in O only (⁶) O om, G M om *atha* (⁷) O om, G M om *yathā* (⁸) W O om (⁹) G M om (¹⁰) O om, G M om *atha* (¹¹) O om (¹²) B *malo-*

This is a mere introduction to the next rule, which informs us what the doctrine is which these dissidents hold instead. The commentator pronounces it the approved doctrine for this *śākhā*.

ततस्वनुस्वारः ॥३॥

3 And claim that, on the contrary, *anusvāra* is inserted after the vowel

The *anusvāra* here prescribed is called by the commentator an *āgama*, 'increment'. Its insertion is the alternative view to the nasalization of the vowel, and, as is pointed out, is held where that nasalization is denied—of which denial, the *tu*, 'on the contrary,' is the sign in the rule. There is one example given *sa trīṇ ekā-daśāṇ iha* (ii 2 11³ W B omit *sa*)

The approval of this rule is, of course, involved in that of its predecessor, and the usage of the recorded Tāttirīya text corresponds

ज्ञादिषु चैकपद उष्मपरः ॥४॥

4 *Anusvāra* is also inserted in the case of *sra* etc., in a single word, before a spirant

"Also" (*ca*) in the rule, we are told, brings down the implication of the above specified increment. The *śrādayas*, '*sra* etc.', are the whole detail, given in the next chapter, of the occurrence of *anusvāra* in the Tāttirīya-Saṁhitā otherwise than as the result of the rules of combination, implied in rules 1-3 of this chapter. The precept, then, is introductory to the detail referred to, and also lays down some general limitations affecting it. The commentator quotes a single case, *ṣoṇṣā modā ve 'ti* (iii 2 9⁵ it falls under xvi 2), and then gives counter examples, establishing the restrictions made. *tāsām trīṇ iha* (ii 5 8³) shows that the insertion is made only under the circumstances defined in chapter xvi, *tam mā sañ srya varcasā* (i 4 45³ et al. only G M have *varcasā*) and *prastaram ā ha sīda* (ii 6 12⁶ found in O only) show that it is to

2 *ekeshām mate pūrvasūtrokṣeshu* ¹ *sānunāśikyam* ² *na* ³ *bhavati uktāny evo 'dāharanāni*

idam ⁴ *'eve* ⁵ *'shtam* ⁶ *na tu pūrvam*

¹ O ins *sīdāneshu* ² G M *na 'nu-* ³ W G M O om ⁴ O *eva sutram ish-*

3. *tata itī sarvanāmnā parāmrśtāt* ¹ *svarāt* ² *parō 'anusvāra* ³ *āgamo bhavati yathā* ⁴ *sa----* *parāmrśtasvarasyā* ⁵ *'nunāśikam* ⁶ *ḡnam tuṣabdo nīvartayati* ⁷ *'ti* ⁸ *tasmād anunāśikapratishedhapalakṣha* ⁹ *evā 'yam anusvārāgamuḥ syāt*

¹ G M *-shta* ² G M *-ra* ³ B G M *-svār* ⁴ G M om ⁵ O *shtāt svarā* ⁶ G M *-ka* ⁷ O *varay-* ⁸ G M O om *iti* ⁹ W B *dhat p-*, G M *-dhat vak shyamāna*

be made only in a single word—that is to say, if I understand the meaning, that if *mā sām* and *hi sīdu* were single words, they would fall respectively under rules 8 and 13 of the next chapter, and have the increment—, and *māyā māyānam* (in 1 11⁷) shows that a spirant must follow (*māyānam* otherwise falling under xvi 8). To the specification *ekapade*, ‘in a single word,’ the commentator adds in his paraphrase the explanation *akhandapade*, ‘in an undivided word,’ and then, in his illustration, he treats this as a restriction or limitation, and establishes it by an example, *trishāhasro vā* (v 6 8³, p *tri-sāhasrah*), rule xvi 25 would otherwise require the increment after *tri*:

नान्तविकारात्पूर्वः ॥ ५ ॥

5 Not before an altered final

The illustrative example is *bahis te astu bāl ite* (in 3 10² G M omit the last two words) we have in it a *s* following *hi* in a single undivided word, and hence, by xvi 13, should have to read *bahis*, but for this restriction. The alteration is from *h* to *s*, according to ix 2. As counter-example is given *mā hiṣṣi dvipādani* (x 2 10¹ G M O omit the last word), a case falling under the rule already referred to

अप्रग्रहाः समानाक्षराण्यनुनासिकान्येकेषाम् ॥ ६ ॥

6 According to some authorities, the simple vowels, except the *pragrahas*, are nasalized

This and the remaining rules of the chapter have the aspect of an intrusion, as they interrupt the natural connection of what precedes and what follows, and merely give the view of certain authorities on points which the Prāticākhyas in general leave untouched. They are brought in here as having to do with nasalized vowels, which are the subject of this chapter and its successor.

With the nasalization thus taught is to be compared that noticed in the Rik Prāt (at 1 16, 1 63, lxiv), which teaches that the first

4 ¹āgamānvādeṣaḥ cakārah srādiṣhv ekapade ²khandapade ³āshmaparo ⁴‘nusvārāgamo bhavati yathā’ ⁵goṇśā---- srādiṣhv ite kim tāsām---- ekapada ite kim tām---- ⁶‘pi ast----’ ⁷akhandavigeshanena ⁸kim trish---- āshmapara ite kim māyā----

(1) wanting in B (2) O pada (3) G M O om (4) in O only (5) O shena

5 na khalu padāntavikārāt ¹pārvasmīn anusvārāgamo bhavati yathā ²bahis---- hiṣṣigā (xvi 13) ite ³pi aptiḥ antavikārāt ite kim mā---- antasya viśāṇo ⁴‘ntavikārah tasnād antavikārāt’ ⁵

¹ W vik- ² G M O om ³ G M om

eight vowels (namely *a, ā, i, ī, u, ū, ɾ, ṛ*) are by [some?] teachers declared nasal when they are not *pragrhya*, and stand as finals before a pause. This is different, first, in including *r* and *ṛ* (which are not *samānākṣharāni* according to our treatise compare 12, but the difference amounts to nothing, as the vowels in question never occur *avasāne*, but only *avagrahe*), and secondly, in limiting the nasalization to finals, before a pause. But it is perfectly evident that our rule also applies to finals only, and, as we shall see, the commentator resorts to great violence to bring in the implication of "final" in rule 8, below. Again, the specification "in *samhitā* also," in rule 8, and the interpretation of *padam* in rule 7 as signifying *padakāle*, 'in *pada*-text,' sufficiently prove that the present precept does not apply in *samhitā*—that is, that *avasāne*, 'in pause,' is implied here. And the absence of statement or *anuvṛtti* of these two essential implications is strong additional evidence that the rules are interpolated.

By most of the MSS, only one example is given, namely *kulāyini vasumatī* (iv 3 4¹), which, if our understanding, as above explained, is correct, is to be read, in *pada*-text, *kulāyiniṣ vasumatīṣ*. *Ō* adds *aminanta evāh* (ii 1 11²), one of the cases of suspended combination falling under x 13, and (by R P1 ii 31,32) in the *Rig Veda* requiring nasalization of the uncombined final. Its citation seems to indicate that *Ō* would not limit the operation of the rule to the *pada*-text. To show that the nasalization does not take place in uncombined vowels, or *pragrahas*, are quoted, in *pada*-form, *amī iti* (ii 3 7¹ et al) and *tanā iti* (ii 2 7⁵ omitted in *Ō*). To illustrate the limitation to simple vowels, we find in most MSS *so evāṛ 'shār 'tasya* (ii 2 9⁷), but *Ō* gives instead *agnaye 'nikavate* (i 8 4¹ et al), *viśṇuav e 'hī 'dam* (ii 4 12³), and *vāyav iṣṭaye* (ii 2 12⁸).

The commentator, as he has done repeatedly before (under i 49, ii 7, v 2), notices the apposition in the rule of *apragrahāḥ* and *samānākṣharāni*, two words of different gender. He signifies, further, under the next rule, that both that and this are unapproved.

पदं च प्लुतं शाङ्खायनकाण्डमायनयोः ॥७॥ .

7 As is also, according to *Çāṅkhāyana* and *Kāṇḍamāyana*, a protracted *pada*.

By *pada* is here signified, according to the commentator, a word

6. ¹ *yāni samānākṣharāny apragrahasamyūṭāni tāny 'ekeshām mate bhavanti*² *anunāsikāni*³ ⁴ *kul-... apragrahā iti kim amī iti 'tanā iti*⁵ *samānākṣharāni 'ti kim 'so-... pragrahākṣharaçabdayor nyatatiṅgatayā*⁶ *pa asparānvayo ghatate na pragrahā apragrahāḥ*⁷ .

¹ *Ō* ins *ekeshām ācāryānam mate* ² *Ō* om ³ *Ō* -*kagumanī patashante* ⁴ *Ō* ins *am* ⁵ *Ō* om ⁶ *Ō* *agn-... viśṇ-... vāy-...* ⁷ *W nyamal*

in the *pada*-text, and the interpretation, as was remarked above, is fully supported by the specification of *samhitā* in the next rule

As examples of nasalized protracted vowels, are given *tvīṣ ity aḥi avīt* (ii 4 12⁶) and *astu hiṣ ity aḥrūtām* (vii 1 6¹), both in *samhitā*-form, although it is again expressly pointed out that the nasalization is not made in *samhitā* the two worthies referred to would read *tvīṣ* and *hiṣ*. It is added that *ca*, 'also,' in this rule effects its connection with what is prescribed in the preceding one—or, as O, in more customary phrase, expresses it, brings forward by implication the preceding rule

Some, we are further informed, restrict the application of the precept to words which contain a single vowel protracted, and would not regard it as authorizing nasalization in *na chinattis itī* (i 7 2^{1,4}) or *na vicatyās itī* (vi 1 9¹). G. M. omit *itī*

The rule is declared to be of no binding force

अकारस्तु संहितायामपि ॥ ८ ॥

8 An *a*, however, is nasalized in *samhitā* also

The commentator's explanation is that nasality and protraction are here implied (from the preceding rule) by vicinage, and that *tu*, 'however,' is intended to annul the implication that only the opinion of the two authorities specified in rule 7 is reported. And though the comprehensive statement "an *a*" is made in the rule, nevertheless, in virtue of rule 1 58, "continued implication is of that which is last (or final)," the "also" (*api*) really brings down only a final *a* as suffering a prescribed effect by the attribution of nasal quality. The sense, then, is that a protracted final *a* is nasalized, both in *samhitā* and elsewhere. Examples are *suclo-kāñṣ sunaṅgalāñṣ* (i 8 16²), *upahūtāñṣ* (ii 6 7³), *yaso mamāñṣ* (vii 4 20), these are, in fact, all the cases of protraction of simple final *a* which the text contains, and the edition (so far as it goes) and my MS nasalize the *ā*, as required by the interpretation of the rule here given. The cases are much more numerous in which a final *ah* exhibits *āṣ* as the ultimate result of protraction, the *h* being lost before a following vowel or sonant consonant—namely, at i 5 9⁶ v 5 1³, 3² twice vi 1 9¹ twice, 3 8¹, 4 3⁴, 6 2³, and in one place, vi 5 8⁴, the same final *āṣ* comes from a protracted *e*. the question might possibly arise whether these do not also fall under

7 *yat' phutavat padam² 'tac ca³ padakāle 'gāṅkṣāyanakāṇḍa-māyanayor mate⁴ 'anāsikam bhavati yathā⁵ tvīṣ---- astu ---- padam itī kim samhitāyām nā bhāt cakārah⁶ pūrvasātroktavādehyasamuccayam⁷ karoti⁸ apara āhuh⁹ 'phutāḥkasvaram padam itī anyam mā bhāt¹⁰ 'na---- na --- ne 'dān sūtradvayan¹⁰ ishtam*

¹ W *yatra* ² O om ³ W *tatra* ⁴ O puts after *bhavati* ⁵ G, M. om. ⁶ G M. O *caḥādāh* ⁷ O *-vādhm* ⁸ O *anvādhāt* ⁹ O *phutevarnapadam itī 'ha mā bhāt* ¹⁰ W *sutram*

the rule, but it would have to be answered in the negative (see the counter-examples below), and the text reads accordingly. The manuscripts of the commentary give as found "in another *śākhā*," one example, read *brahmān* in *W B* (*O* is wanting), and *yadghrā* in *G M*. I do not quite know what to make of this, as there seems to be no call for quoting from another text examples of what is capable of being fully illustrated from the received Veda of the school, *brahmān* is found at 18 16¹ twice, ² twice, but would be a counter-example to this rule, its *a* not being final, it is, in fact, of the same character with the first of the counter-examples given. These are *satyan āyān* (18 16²), *agnāḥ ity āha* (v1 5 8⁴ *W* has dropped out *agnāḥ*), and *vicityah somāḥ na vicitryāḥ iti* (v1 1 9¹ *O* has only this).

Finally, the commentator remarks that *Çankhayana* and *Kānda-māyana* also accept this principle. He may well say this, for the natural interpretation of the rule is to make it represent simply the view of those authorities, and the action of the comment, in cutting it loose from its predecessors, and declaring it alone to express the approved doctrine of the treatise, is in a high degree forced and arbitrary. It was noticed under 158 what an unjustifiable act of violent interpretation was there committed, by way of preparation for this one. The implication of "final" is not needed in rule 8 any more than in rules 6 and 7, and is clearly enough made in them all, whence it comes, it would be the business of those who put the passage in to tell, if they could.

The *Āth Pīṭ* gives (at 1105) an enumeration of the protracted vowels occurring in the text to which it relates. Thus our treatise omits to do, and it may be well to repair the omission in this place. A final *a* is protracted to *āḥ* at 18 16² twice 11 6 7³ vii 4 20 — *ah* to *āḥ* at 14 27 v 5 1³, and to *āḥ* (the *h* being lost) at 15 9⁶ v 5 1³, 3² twice vi 1 9¹ twice, 3 8¹, 4 3⁴, 6 2³ — *an* to *ān* at 18 16¹ twice, 16² thrice 11 6 5⁶ — *am* to *ām* at vi 1 4⁵, 5 9¹ vii 1 7⁴, 5 7¹ twice — *i* to *ī* at 17 2^{1,4} 11 4 12⁶ vi 5 9¹ vii 1 6^{1,7} — *ih* to *īḥ* or *īr* at 15 9⁶ vi 3 10¹ — *in* to *īn* at vii 4 20 twice — *uh* to *ūr* at vi 3 8¹ — *e* to *āḥ* at 14 27 vi 1 4⁵, and

§ *sāmudhyād anuṇāsikaphutāu' grhyete tuṣabdah prakṛtācā-ryamatanuvartakah² ata' eva' saṁhātāyām asaṁhātāyām' cā' kārāh padāntah pluto 'nuṇāsiko bhavati yady apy akāra it³ sāmānyeno' ktaḥ tathā' ṛy anvādeṣo 'ntyasya* (158) *iti vacanād apiṣabdo 'nuṇāsikadharmatayā nūmattinam padāntam eva' kām anvādeṣati yathā' suṣl----- upa----- yaṣo----- brahmān⁹ ity anyasyām¹⁰ śākhāyām⁸ apiṣabdah kimarthah¹¹ saty--- agn----- vicityah--- śāṅkhāyanahāndamāyanayor apy ayam vidhur¹² akāre plute sammatāh¹²*

¹ *G M* *plute* ² *O* *purvacary-* ³ *W* *eta*, *M* *tata* ⁴ *O* *om* ⁵ *W* *O* *om* ⁶ *O* *om* ⁷ *B* *O* *om* ⁸ *O* *om* ⁹ *G M* *yadghrā* ¹⁰ *G M* *asya* ⁽¹¹⁾ *O* *om* ⁽¹²⁾ *G M* *rapulas sammatam*

to *ā* (see 14) at vi 5 8⁴ — *du* to *āsv* at vi 6 2³ The protracted syllable has always the acute accent

सर्वमेकयमं पूर्वेषां सर्वमेकयमं पूर्वेषाम् ॥ १ ॥

9 According to the former ones, all is of one pitch

The comment is completely at a loss as to how this rule is to be understood, and gives three more or less discordant interpretations of it, the first of which we are probably to regard as the preferred one, if there be a preference. "All" means 'every kind of articulated sound,' "of one pitch" is equivalent to *ekagruti*, *yama* denoting the tone of an acute syllable, "the former ones" are 'the sacrificers,' the meaning is, then, that in the sacrificial usage of the sacrificers everything is uttered in acute monotone. *Ō* has an exposition of its own, which is in great part too corrupt to be read without considerable emendation, and which conducts to the same conclusion. It quotes, *apropos* of *pārve*, a *pada* of a *tristubh* verse from some sacred text, "the former ones spoke those words to the former ones."

The second interpretation differs from the first only in declaring *pārve*, 'the former ones,' to designate certain *śākhinah*, or 'holders of a Vedic text.'

The third is of quite another character, it makes *yama* to be equivalent to *svara* in the sense of 'vowel,' and explains 'every monosyllable is nasalized'—the intent being to annul the restriction to simple vowels only (as made in rule 6). Who the *pārve* are, is not told us this time.

The commentator consoles himself at the end by declaring the rule not approved. We may fairly extend the same condemnation

9 'sarvam' varṇajātam³ ekayamam⁴ ekagruti⁵ 'ti pūrveshām⁶ matam⁷ yamo nāma svara⁸ udātta ity arthah⁹ pārve nāma yājñikāḥ¹⁰ teshām yajñakarmāṇi sarvam¹¹ ekagruti¹² bhavati¹³

anye manyante¹⁴ pārve nāma keci chākhinah¹⁵ teshām sarvam¹⁶ 'ekagruti¹⁷ 'ti¹⁸

athā¹⁹ 'pare kathayanti²⁰ sarvam ekasvaram anuśāsikam bhavati²¹ 'ti²² 'samānāśharamātrāpekshām adhiksheptum²³

ne 'dam sūtram vṣtam

iti tribhāshyaratne prātisākhyaṇṇavarane
pañcadaśo²⁴ 'dhyāyah

(1) *O* substitutes *sarvam* *iti lakshyaṇi lakṣaṇavṛttayāṇi grhṇati* *ekayam* *ekagruti* *iti yama* *grutisvara* *ity athāntarā pūrveshā pūrva nāma yājñikāḥ pūrve pūrveshyo vaca etad ucir* *iti darśanat yājñikāntam yajñakarmāṇi sarvam ekagruti bhavati* ² *W B sarva* ³ *B varṇam ajātam*, *G M tayamam* ⁴ *W sarv* ⁵ *G M put* after *udātta* ⁶ *W ānyāḥ* ⁷ *W puts after bhavati* ⁸ *B -tur* ⁹ *O āhuh* ¹⁰ *O om* (11) *W -grutām*, *O -gruti bhavati* ¹² *G M om atha* ¹³ *O vydaśhate* ¹⁴ *O om iti* ¹⁵ *O sarvam iti samānāśharaṇām apekshā grahavyūddesa sarvam tathā vidhuyate*, *W -ramatrāpekshām apiksheptam*, *B -ksham adh*, *G M mātrāpeksham ākshiptum*, ¹⁶ *G M O dvitrayaṇṇe tritrayo*

to his treatment of it, and conjecture that, if he could only have told us what it meant, we might have found in it something to approve. We are tempted to seek in it some statement as to the accent of the protracted syllable, or *pada*, and, if it were allowed to amend *pārveshām* to *ekeshām*, we might translate, 'some hold that the whole word in which protraction occurs is to be uttered in the same tone'—only then, to be sure, we should look for a statement of the usage actually followed in the text

CHAPTER XVI

CONTENTS 1-31, detail of the cases of occurrence, in the *Sanhitā*, of *ñ* in the interior of a word, before a spirant.

अथ सकारपराः ॥ १ ॥

1 Now for cases in which *s* follows

A simple heading, of force through a considerable part of the chapter (1 e through rule 13). The essential item of the precept laid down was given above, in xv 4, which directed that in all the cases to be specified in this chapter is to be assumed the presence of *anusvāra* following a vowel and followed by a spirant. Words in which that spirant is *s* form by far the most numerous class, and until rule 14 they alone are treated.

The *Rik Pr* is the only one of the other treatises which offers anything at all analogous with this enumeration, it (at xiii 7-10) gives rules for the occurrence of *anusvāra* after long vowels only.

सशोक्पाश पदादयः स्वरपरे ॥ २ ॥

2 *Sra*, *ṣo*, *ha*, *pā*, and *ṣa*, at the beginning of a *pada*, take *anusvāra* before a *s* that is followed by a vowel.

The commentator cites examples, as follows. For *sra*, *visrañśayed amehenā 'dhvāryuh* (vi 2 9⁴, 10⁷ G M O have only the first word), we have other cases at ii 5 7² v 1 6¹ vii 3 10³, all from the same root, *sras*. For *ṣo*, *ṣoñśā modā ve 'ti* (iii 2 9⁵ G M omit the last word, O the last two), I have noted no other case as counter-example, to show that only *o* after *ṣ* takes the increment, is given *āṣāsānā sūumanasam* (i 1 10¹ O alone has the latter

1 *athe 'ty ayam adhikārah ita uttare grahanaviṣeṣhāh¹ sakāraparā² ity etad adhikertam veditavyam sakārah paro 'yebhyas te sakāraparāh³*

¹ B *śah* ² B *'para* ³ G M *yasmāt sa tathoktah* (and *-parah* in the rule)

word) For *ha*, *hañsaḥ gurishad* (i 8 15² iv 2 1⁵), various other cases of *hañsa* are found in the text, and *hañsa* that *hā* is not treated in the same way is shown by *prayā mā mā hāsīt* (v 6 8¹ O omits) For *pā*, *pāñsura vrāvati* (i 2 13²), other cases are *pāñsūn* and *pāñsavadya*, at ii 6 10² and iv 5 9¹ respectively that *pa* would not have been correct is shown by *āhatam gubhe pasah* (vi 4 19³ O omits *āhatam*), *pāsi*, which would seem to fall under the rule, is excepted by rule 17, below For *ṣa*, *yad āsinah ṣaṅsati tasmāt* (iii 2 9⁷ W B G M omit *tasmāt*, thus allowing the citation to be found also at iii 2 9⁶), cases of this combination, all of them coming from the root *ṣaṅs*, are not infrequent in the *Sanhitā* As general counter-examples, we have, to establish the necessity of the restriction "at the beginning of a *pada*," *agnir ukthēna vāhasā* (i 5 11¹), *somam pipāset* (ii 1 10¹), and *dahā "ṣa- saḥ* (i 2 14⁶ O omits), while *tasmāt sa visrasyah* (vi 2 9⁴, 10⁷ only O has the first two words), *hastayoh* (iv 1 5³ et al G M O omit), and *kaviṣastāh* (ii 6 12⁶ all the MSS have *-ṣastah*, which I have not found in the text, but probably by my own fault) do the same service for the specification "when a vowel follows"

The commentator goes on to say that some authorities accept *hi* as a part of this rule which is not to be approved, since "at the beginning of a word" is here implied, and so *ahiñśāyā* (v 2 8⁷) would be left without the increment And if it be pleaded that *hiñśih parama* (iv 2 10^{1 2} et al) should be an example here, the reply is made, that the *anusvāra* is assured to it by rule 13, below, where there is no restriction to the beginning of a word, and that to repeat here the specification of *hi* would be useless The only criticism to be offered upon this is that the objection has too little reason to be really worthy of notice

2 sra go ha pā ṣa ity ete grahanaviṣeshdh¹ padādayah sakāraparās tasmāt sakāre svarapare saty anusvārāgumam² bhajante³ yathā⁴ vi---- goñśā---- okārena kim āṣā---- hañsaḥ---- ⁵hrasva iti kim prajā---- ⁶pāñsura---- dīrghena⁵ kim āh---- yad---- padādaya iti kim agnir---- somam---- ⁷dahā----⁷ svarapara iti kim. tasmāt---- ⁸has---- ⁹kav----

kecid atra sūtre ¹⁰higrahanam¹⁰ āṅgikurvate¹¹ tad anupapannam padādaya iti nyamāt ahiñśāyā ity atra ¹²anusvārābhāvaprasaṅgāt¹² nanu hiñśih-- ity etad atra ¹³dāharamam iti cet mā ¹⁴vam ¹⁵hipuṣṭigā (xvi 13) ity atra nyamābhāvāt padādāpādādāu ca¹⁶ higrahanasya kāryasiddheḥ punar atra grahanam vyartham¹³

svarah paro yasmād asāu svaraparah tasmān

¹ G M *-naparāh vi-* ² O *-ma* ³ O *syāt* ⁴ G M O om ⁽⁵⁾ O om ⁶ G M *hrasvena. kim* etc ⁷ O *-ghe* ⁽⁸⁾ O om ⁽⁹⁾ G M O om ⁽¹⁰⁾ W om ¹¹ G M *kim* ¹² G M *āṅgik-* ¹³ G M *rabhā-*, O *rābodhapra* ⁽¹⁴⁾ B om

विकृते ऽपि ॥ ३ ॥

3 Even when the vowel is altered

That is to say, even when the vowel that is by the last rule required to follow the *s* has undergone euphonic alteration, so as to become a consonant. A single example is cited, *apahaṅsy agne* (iv 7 13¹, p *apa-huṅsi*), if the text contains any others, they have escaped my notice

रापूर्वश्च ॥ ४ ॥

4 As also, when they are preceded by *rā*

This rule is made for the purpose of establishing a single additional case under the general rule given above (xvi.2), namely, the word *nārāṇṣibhyah* (vii 5 11²), the case being one, as the comment points out, where the *ṣa* is not at the beginning of a *pada*. The *ca*, 'also,' brings down only *ṣa*, and we are assured that this is the reason why *ṣa* was mentioned last in rule 2, even at the cost of a violation of the natural order of the vowels. Of this point we need not make much, since the rule contains other and unexplained violations of alphabetic order.

शस्त्वान्तोदत्ते ॥ ५ ॥

5 Also in *ṣaṅstā*, except when it is accented on the final syllable

Here is another single case, falling under rule 2 by the suspension of one of the restrictions laid down in that rule—namely, that the *s* be followed by a vowel. The passage is *utā ṣaṅstā sūvprah* (iv 6 8² O omits *sūvprah*). The restriction as to accent

3 *apīcabdah svarānvādeṣakah¹ sakāśāt pare tasmint svare vikrtam āpanne 'pi vyañjanatām upagate 'pi syād² anusvāravādhik³ yathā apa----*

¹ B *sakaran-* ² W and O (?) *svaṛad* ³ lacuna in O, from (*anusvara-*) *vādhik* to *svara* under the next rule

4 *'caṣabdah sṛāḍishu¹ ṣakāram anvādeṣati² etadārtam eva svaravyatyaye³ 'pi ṣakāragrahanam tatṛā 'nte krtam rā ity evampārvaḥ ṣakārah sukāraparo 'nusvārāgamam bhajate yathā⁴ nār----- apādādyartho⁵ 'yam ārambhah*

(¹) W *ṣabdasyaḍishu*, B *sacaṣabdhāḍishu* ² W B ins *caṣarah* ³ G M *vyak-taye*, O begins again with *vyatyaye* ⁴ G M O om ⁵ W O *apādārtho*

5 *ṣaṅstā ity etasmin¹ grahane 'nantodātte² sakārapare bhavaty³ anusvārāgamah uta----- anantodātta⁴ iti kim aṣv----- sraṣoha* (xvi 2) *iti prāptāu satyām⁵ sakārasya⁶ svaraparavā-*

is intended to exclude *āḥvasyā viṣastā'* (iv 6 9³ O adds *dvā yam-*)

अशस्न् ॥ ६ ॥

6 Also in *acañsan*

Yet another case belonging with those disposed of by rule 2, but requiring special treatment because the *ca* in it does not stand "at the beginning of a *pada*" The passage is *abhi vy acañsan* (vi 6 11⁵)

O, in an added paragraph, brings forward the objection that, in virtue of rule 1 52 (which makes the citation of any word include also the same word with *a* prefixed), *acañsan* has its *ñ* already assured by rule 2, but refutes it by pointing out that the principle appealed to has to do only with a *pada* or word, not with a mere fragment of one, like *ca* (compare rule 10, below) It adds that "another reading is *cañsān*"

न शसनं विशसनेन ॥ ७ ॥

7 But not in *śasanam* and *viśasanena*

These are exceptions, the only ones the Saṃhita affords, under rule 2 The passages are *śasanam vāgy arvā* (iv 6 7⁵ O ends with *vāgyī*) and *śuno viśasanena* (v 7 23)

T and O have the simple *pada śasanena*, instead of *viśasanena* (p *vi-śasanena*) in the rule, and O reads the same in its comment This is doubtless an emendation, and makes a reading more strictly in accordance with the approved usage of the treatise The comment has (especially in the fourth chapter) explained away many a like inaccuracy by the allegation of a phrase "in another *śākhā*" and we might expect to find added here *vī'ti kim ācañsanene* 'ti *śākhāntare*

bhāve 'pi nā 'yam vidhīr nishīdhyatām 'iti grahanam⁸ anta⁹
udātto yasya tad antodāttam¹⁰ nā 'ntodāttam¹⁰ anantodāttam
tasmin¹¹

¹ O *asmin* ² W B O *antod* ³ O *syād* ⁴ W *antod* ⁵ G M om ⁶ W B *śākh-* ⁷ G M ins *eva* ⁸ B *padagr-* ⁹ W O *ante* ⁽¹⁰⁾ O om ¹¹ O adds *apadādhyartho* *ity anentān* (which belongs at the end of the comment on rule 6)

6 *acañsann ity asman grahane syād anusvārāyamah abhi*
---- ¹*apadādhyartho 'yam ārambhah¹*

¹ O puts at end of comment on rule 5, and adds, partly there and partly here (a little amended), *hmarītham idam sraṣohapaṣa* (xvi 2) *ity anentā 'va tatsiddhau apy akārād* (1 52) *'h vacanāt mā 'vam apy akārād 'h vacanam padasya padavayavah ṣaṣabdhah ṣvñsān it pāthāntaram*

7 *śasanam viśasanena¹ ity etayor grahanayor² anusvārā-*
gamo na syāt śas- ---- śuno- ---- sraṣoha (xvi 2) *iti prāptiḥ*

¹ O, *śas-*, as also (with T) in the rule itself, ² O om

मा पदादिरनुदात्तः ॥ ८ ॥

8 *Mā* takes *anusvān* a when beginning a *pada* and unaccented

All the implications of rule 2 are here cut off (as is distinctly enough intimated by the express repetition of one of them, *padādi*), and hence it is to be understood that the increment takes place before a *s* whether this be or be not followed by a vowel. The examples are *āhar māñsēna* (v 7 20) and *māñspācanyāh* (iv 6 9¹). The restriction to the beginning of a *pada* is established by quoting *sūkamadhyamāsah* (iv 6 7⁴), that as to the accent, by *mā'sam dikshatāh syāt* (v 6 7³ only O has *syāt*).

So far as I have discovered, this rule applies only to forms and combinations of *māñsa*, which are not infrequent in the *Sanhita*. The four following rules give it certain extensions and limitations

पुमीपूर्वश्च नित्यम् ॥ ९ ॥

9 As also when preceded by *pu* or *mī*, under all circumstances

The closing specification of the rule amounts to a removal of the restriction as to accent, imposed in rule 8—that as to initial position being virtually removed by the prescribed prefixion of *pu* or *mī*. The examples quoted are *ut pumāñsañ haranti* (vi 5 10³ O omits *haranti*, and B runs the two citations together, having dropped out a part of each) and *mīmāñsante kārīye* (vi 2 6⁴). We have *pumāñsam* again at iv 6 6⁵, and other forms of *mīmāñs* at vi 2 6⁴ and vii 5 7¹. I have noted no other words as falling under the rule

सकायपरश्च ॥ १० ॥

10 And when followed by *sakāya*

The *ca*, 'and,' we are told, here brings down *mā*, and G M add that the intent of the rule is to establish an exception under

8 *mā ity evam¹ varnaḥ padādir anudāttaḥ sakāraparo 'nu-svārāgamam bhajate uti a nyamābhāvāt sakārasya svaraparavādbhāve'pi nimittatvam bhavaty eva yathā² ahar----* *māñs-*
--- padādir iti kim sili- -- anudātta iti kim mā'sam

¹ G M O *ayam* ² O *om*

9 *caṣabdo me 'ti jñāpayati pu mī ity evampārvo me 'ti¹ varnaḥ sakāraparo nityam anusvārāgamam bhajate ut----* *mīm----- anudāttatvanivartako² nityaṣabdaḥ*

¹ G M O *ms ayam* ² O *nyamavyavar*

rule 8—that is to say, to bring under that rule a word which would otherwise be excluded in virtue of the requisition “when beginning a *pada*” The case is similar to that about which O raises a question under rule 6 The passage is *amāṅśakāya svāhā* (vii 5 12²)

नावग्रहपूर्वः ॥ ११ ॥

11 But not when preceded by a former member of a compound

Or, ‘by a pause or division (between the two members of a compound),’ taking *avagraha* in its more original sense W B O define the rule as establishing exceptions under rule 8, G M, which have taken in this notification (less correctly) as part of the preceding comment, say simply that *mā* is to be understood as implied here by vicinage The examples given are *pūrnāmāse vā* (ii 5 5⁴ O omits *vā*) and *ardhamāse devāḥ* (ii 5 6⁶ twice) The words would satisfy all the conditions of rule 8, the separated element *-māse* or *-māse* being itself (by 148) a *pada* Since *māṅśa* nowhere appears as the latter member of a compound, this rule exempts from the increment of *anusvāra* all the cases in which forms of *mā*s or *māsa* are found in such a situation, others are the subject of the next following precept

मासिमासुमासोमासामिति च ॥ १२ ॥

12 Nor in *māsi*, *māsu*, *māsah*, or *māsaṁ*

These are words which, without special exception, would fall under rule 8 The examples for the last three are *duṣṣu māsaḥ ttiṣṭhan* (vii 5 2²), *śān māso dākṣhineṇa* (vi 5 3⁴ only O has the last word), and *māsaṁ prātiṣṭhatyā* (vii 5 1⁶) we have *māsāh* also at vii 5 7¹, and *māsaṁ* at vi 7 18 The first, *māsi*, raises a difficulty Some, the commentator says, cite in illustration of it *prathamē māsi prsthāni* (vii 5 3¹ O omits the last word), but this is wrong, for the exemption of *māsi* in that passage is assured by rule 17, below we are to assume, then, the occurrence in another text of some word of more than two syllables beginning

10 *caṣabdo me ’ty jñāpayati me ’ty evaṁ¹ varṇah sukāyaparo² ’nusvārāgamam³ bhajate am-....⁴*

¹ B G M O *ayam* ² W B *sakṛup* ³ G M *nyam anu-* ⁴ G M add *mā padādār anudatta* (xvi 8) *ity asya ’yam apavādaḥ*

11 *’mā padādu anudatta* (xvi 8) *ity asya ’yam apavādaḥ¹ avagrahapūro me ’ty evaṁ² varṇo nā³ ’nusvārāgamam bhajate yathā⁴ pūrn-.... urdha-.... avagrahaḥ pūro yasmād’asāv avagrahapūrah⁵*

(¹) G M have this as part of the comment on the preceding rule, and substitute here *sannūhyan nā ity labhyate* ² B G M O *ayam* ³ B om *na* ⁴ G M O om (⁵) G M *sa tathoktah*,⁴⁸ W om *asāv*

with *māsi*. This interpretation is, of course, forced and false. *māsi* is included with the rest here because it is an example of the same class with them, and the makers of the treatise, when they put it in, either overlooked or neglected the fact that it falls technically under rule 14, and so also under rule 17, establishing exceptions to 14. We have also *masi-māsi*, more than once, at vii 51⁶.

हिपुत्रिगात्रिधाहंसिनेऽतस्सयदातास्सीत्कनीयाज्याया-
द्राधीयार्धीयाश्रेयाहसीयावसीयाभूयाऽसोज्जिवाज्जिवा-
ज्जिगिवाज्जिगिवातस्थिवादाश्चादिविवापपिवापीपिवावि-
द्वाविविशिवाशुश्रुवाससृवा ॥ १३ ॥

13 The following words have *anusvāra* before *s* *hi*, *pu*, *jigā*, *jughā*, *chaṅsine*, *ataṅsayat*, *ātāṅsit*, *kaṇṇiyā*, *jyāyā*, *daḡghīyā*, *ra*, *ghīyā*, *creyā*, *hrasīyā*, *vasīya*, *bhūyāṅsaḥ*, *jakshvā*, *jaghṇvā*, *ji*, *grvā*, *jīgvā*, *tasṭhvā*, *dāçvā*, *dīdvā*, *papivā*, *pīpivā*, *vidvā*, *vuv*, *çrvā*, *çuçruvā*, *sasrvā*.

The commentator's examples are as follows. *hiṅsīḥ paramē vyoman* (iv 2 10^{2,3} O omits *vyoman*, and G M substitute *mā hiṅsīḥ tanuvā*, iv 2 3¹ et al) and *cinute 'hiṅsāyā* (v 2 8⁷ O omits *cinute*), respecting this first specification, see further below, — *tena puṅsvatīḥ* (ii 5 8⁵) and *puṅsuh putrān* (iv 6 9⁴). I have only noted farther two cases of *puṅsaḥ*, at ii 6 5⁵ and vi 5 8², — *lokam aḡḡāṅsan* (v 5 5⁴ vi 5 8² O omits *lokam*) elsewhere only at iii 2 2³, — *vasatāraṇ aḡḡāṅsan* (vi 5 8⁴) the text presents fourteen other cases of *jughāṅs*, — *brāhmaṇāchaṅsine* (i 8 18) the only case a counter-example (but O omits all the counter-examples), *pra yuchasy ubhe nī pāsī* (i 4 22), shows the necessity of including in the citation the *ne* of *chaṅsine*, — *gabhe mushtim ataṅsayat* (vii 4 19⁴), with a counter-example, *atasam na gushkam* (i.2 14²), to explain the citation of the whole word *ataṅsayat*, — *anvātāṅsit tvayī* (iv 7 13⁵ O omits *tvayī*), with *anu vrātāṅs tava* (iv 6 7³), to prove the need of the final *it*, — *kaṇṇiyāṅso devāḥ* (v 3 11¹) the text offers half-a-dozen cases of this comparative, and about the same number of the next, — *jyāyāṅso bhrātaraḥ*.

12 'cakāro nishedhākarshakah' māsi----- ity eteshu gruhā-
neshu na syād anusvārāgamah eshām api mā padādīr (xvi 8)
iti prāptih kecid atra prath---- ity udāharanti' tad usādhu
na pade dvīsvare nityam³ (xvi 17) ity anenā 'va nishedha-
siddheh' tasmād anyagākkhāyām⁵ bahuvaram apuram⁶ udāhara-
nam avadhāranīyam dāçasu----- shan----- māsam-----

⁽¹⁾ O om ⁽²⁾ W -ranam ⁽³⁾ W O r, G M om ⁽⁴⁾ W dham siddhah, B -dhah
siddhah ⁽⁵⁾ G M anyasyām ç ⁽⁶⁾ B G M param, O om

(u 6 6¹ et al), —*drāghīyāñsāu bhavatah* (v 2 5¹) the only case, —*atho raghīyāñsah* (v 11 4 9) also the only case, —*pra gre yāñsam* (u 4 1⁴ but O substitutes the only other case, *gre yāñsam pāpīyān*, v 1 2³), —*athu krasīyāñsam ākramanam* (v 1 6 4² but G M O omit the last word, thus allowing the citation to include also the only other case, found in the same division), —*vasīyāñsam bhāgadheyena* (v 4 10⁵) there are two or three further cases, —*bhāyāñso 'nye bhyañ* (v 11 1 5⁵), with *unnādo bhāyāñsam* (i 6 2³ et al) as counter-example, proving that the final *h* had to be cited with the rest of the word there are seven other cases of *bhāyāñs* in the text, —*jakshivāñsah papivāñsah* (i 4 44² O omits the last word) the only case, —*vrtram jaghnavāñsam mrdho 'bha* (u 5 3¹ W B omit the first word, O the first and last, G M have only the first two, which are read also at u 5 4⁵) I have noted the word besides only at u 1 10² three times, with the negative prefix, —*vājam jīgvāñsah* (i 7 8⁴) the only case, —for *jīgvā* is found only a case “in another *śākhā*,” namely *jīgvāñsasya* (so W G M, though the word is not grammatically admissible, O has *jīgvāñsam yāmu* [i e -ñsah syāma²], B is corrupt, running the previous citation and this together into *vājam jīgvāñsam iti śākhāntare*), —*dyumnā tathvāñso janānām* (i 2 14⁴ O alone has the last word) there is one other case, at iv 2 2², —*dāgvāñso dāgvah sutam* (i 4 16 O alone has *sutam*) another case at u 2 12³, —*gucayo dīdvāñsam* (u 5 12²) another case at i 2 14⁴, —*papivāñsah ca vīve* (i 4 44²) the only case, —*pīpivāñsah sarasvatah* (u 1 11² O has -*tas trayah*, probably corrupt for *ta stanam*, as the text reads) the only case, —*vidvāñso vā purā hotārah* (u 5 11^{1 2} only O has the last two words) and *avidvāñsah cakrma* (iv 7 15⁶ O begins *vishtāvid*, by mutilation of the preceding word in the passage) the *Sanhitā* has over thirty cases of *vidvāñs*, —*pravvīgvāñsam imahe* (iv 7 15¹), —*yac chucruvāñsah* (u 5 9² twice) there is another case at v 3 4¹, —and, finally, *vāpañ sasrvāñsah* (i 7 8⁴).

After the second example (*ahīñsāyā*), G M insert the remark that it is brought under the present rule by the principle of “prefixing of *a*” (i 52) This is wrong, being inconsistent with the

13 'h-----¹ ity evampūrvah saḥāraparo 'nusvā āgamo² bhavati³ yathā⁴ kiñsih----- cin-----⁵ tena----- puñsah----- lokam----- tvasht----- brāhm-----⁶ na iti kim pra-----⁷ gabhe-----⁸ yad iti kim atasam-----⁹ anv-----¹⁰ id iti kim anu-----¹¹ kan----- jyāy----- drāgh----- atho----- pra-----¹² atha----- vasi----- bhāy-----¹³ visargena kim ann-----¹⁴ jaksh----- vrtram----- vājam----- jīgvāñsasye¹⁵ iti śākhāntare dyum-----¹⁶ dāgv-----¹⁷ gucayo----- papiv-----¹⁸ pīpiv-----¹⁹ vidv----- avid----- pravv-----²⁰ yac-----²¹ vāpañ-----²² dāgvavvīgvāñsah²³ 'ty atra sradīshu cā²⁴ 'kapada (xv 4) iti prāptiā śākhāraparo 'nusvā āgamaḥ kim

आकारिकारोकाराः सिषिपराः पदान्तयोः ॥ १४ ॥

14 The vowels *ā*, *i*, and *ū* have *anusvāra*, when they are followed by *si* or *shi* final

This rule, of course, applies to the nominative, accusative, and vocative plural of neuters in *as*, *is*, and *us*. The illustrative examples are *vayāñsi pakvagandhena* (v 7 23), *tamāñsi gūhatām apu-
shṭā* (1 8 22⁵ only O has *apushṭā*), *daça havīñshi* (vii 5 14²), *jyo-
tiñshi kurute* (v 4 1⁴ O omits), *agna āyāñshi* (1 3 14⁷ et al.), and *avabhṛthayajāñshi juhote* (vi 6 3¹ G M omit *juhote*). To show that the *si* or *shi* must be final, are quoted *tasmād vāsishtho brahmā* (iii 5 2¹ only G M have *brahmā*), and *manīshino manasā* (iv 6 2⁵ O omits *manasā*). To show that the preceding vowel must be long, we have *yathā 'nasi yukta ādhīyate* (v 4 10² only G M have the last word), *jyotis tvā jyotiśi* (1 1 10³), and *āyushi durone* (1 2 14³), and, finally, to show that no other vowel than *i* after the *s* or *sh* calls out the increment, *prayāsv eva prayātāsu* (vi 4 1³), *oshadhīshu* (iii 5 5² et al.), and *tanūshu buddham* (1 8 22⁵).

The last six counter-examples are omitted in O, which adds at the end the obvious remark that, as *si* and *shi* are here indicated as occasions of the preceding *anusvāra*, that value no longer belongs to *s* merely—that is to say, the force of the heading given in rule 1 is henceforth at an end

विकृते ऽपि ॥ १५ ॥

15 Even when the *i* is altered

That the *i* of the ending *si* or *shi* is here aimed at is in the nature of the case obvious enough, but not at all distinctly intimated by the terms of the rule. The commentator quotes in illustration *chandāñsy upa dadhāti* (v 3 8^{1,2}), *havīñshy ā sādāyet* (1 6 10³), and *tapāñshy agne juhvā* (1 2 14¹ G M omit *juhvā*)

14 *sishiparā ākārekārokārās tayoh sishyoh padāntayoh sator
anusvārāgamam bhagante¹ yathā² vay- ---- tam- ---- daça
---- 'jyot- ---- 'agna- ---- avabh- ---- padāntayoh⁴ ite kim
tasmād- ---- manī- ---- 'ākānekārokārā ite⁵ dīrghena⁶ kim
yathā- ---- jyotis- ---- āyushi- ---- sishī⁷ 'ty⁸ atre⁹ 'kārena
kim pray- ---- osh- ---- tan- ---- '*

¹ MSS *jate* ² O om ³ O om ⁴ O -ta ⁵ G M *dīrghash*, O om with all that follows ⁶ W B *ity* ⁷ O adds *sishiparanumittayoh nideçāti sakārasya paranumittatva bhāti*

15 *apīçabādānvādishte¹ sishyor ikāre vikṛte 'pi yakāram āpanne
'pi bhavaty anusvārāgamam yathā² chand- ---- hav- ----
tap- ----*

¹ W B O -bādv-, G M bādvā 'nv- ² G M O om

अनाकारो ह्रस्वः सांकृत्यस्य ॥ १६ ॥

16 According to Sāmkrtya, the vowel, except *ā*, is short

That is to say, the two vowels *i* and *u*, to which alone reference has been made above, become short in the cases here referred to for example, in *haviṇṣhi bhavanti* (v 5 1⁷ et al O omits *bhavanti*) and *samīkṣṭayayāṇṣhi juhōti* (vi 6 2¹ G M O omit *juhōti*), where Sāmkrtya would read *haviṇṣhi* and *yayūṇṣhi*, while in *vayāṇṣi* (v 7 23 et al O omits) he would admit the long vowel

A curious case of dissent upon a point in grammar which we have not been accustomed to regard as open to any difference of opinion The rule is, naturally enough, pronounced unapproved

G M add *ca* to the rule, after *sāmkrtyasya*

न पदे द्विस्वरे नित्यम् ॥ १७ ॥

17 Not, under any circumstances, in a dissyllabic word

This is a rule prescribing exceptions under rule 14, the addition *nityam*, 'under any circumstances,' confirms its application to words ending in *si* or *shi* after *ā*, *i*, or *u* which would otherwise fall under any other rule prescribing the increment

Examples under rule 14 alone are first quoted, namely *stuto yāsi vacāṇ amu* (18 5¹ G M O end with *yāsi*) and *yāsi dātāh* (iii 5 3² G M have dropped out *yāsi*) Then, as a case also under rule 2, we have *vidhatah pāsi nu tmanā* (13 14¹), and, as one under rule 8, *prathame māsi prsthāni* (vii 5 3¹ G M omit the last word), which has been already made the subject of discussion under rule 12, above The force of the *nityam* does not go so far as to prohibit an *anusvāra* in every dissyllabic word before *si*, what-

16 *ākāṇḍ anyo 'nākārah ikāra ukāraḥ ce 'ty arthah taylor eva prakrtatvāt sāmkrtyasya mata ikāra ukāraḥ ca hrasvam āpadyate yathā' hav----- sam----- 'anākāra iti kim vayāṇṣi*²

ne 'dam sūtram ishtam

¹ O om ⁽²⁾ O om

17 *dvivare¹ pade vartamānā² ākārekārokārāh³ padāntasish- parā⁴ nā⁵ 'nusvārāgamam⁶ bhagante yathā' stuto---- 'yāsi ---- nityaḥ padāh prāptyantarapratishedhārthah vidhatah ----⁸ 'sraḥ oha¹⁰ (xvi 2) iti prāptih prathame---- mā pa- dādīr¹¹ (xvi 8) iti prāptih dvau svarāu yasmin¹² vidyete tad dvivaram tasmīn⁹*

¹ O *dvivasu-* ² G M *-na* ³ G M *ākārah ikārah*, O *ākārahikārāh* ⁴ G M *ntas sishipao*, O *nā si* ⁵ B om, G M *nityam nā* ⁶ B ins *na*, O ins *nityam* ⁷ G M O om ⁽⁸⁾ W om ⁽⁹⁾ B om ¹⁰ O *hapāḥ padādāya*, ¹¹ O *dir yās* ¹² G M ins *pade*

ever vowel precedes, or it would include *hañsi* also, and possibly other cases

म्जीषिजिगामिजिघास्यजामियजामिदामिधासिवर्तया-
सि च ॥ १८ ॥

18 Nor in *rjāshi*, *jgāsi*, *jghāsi*, *ajāsi*, *yajāsi*, *dadāsi*, *dadhāsi*, and *varṭayāsi*

These are verbal forms which need to be excepted under rule 14, and which, as containing more than two syllables, are not reached by rule 17. The passages in which they occur are quoted by the commentary, as follows: *tena rjāshi sarvāni* (iii 2 2¹ only O has *sarvāni*), *achā jgāsi* (iv 2 4²), *ā tvam ajāsi garbhādhām* (vii 4 19¹), *haviṣhā yajāsy agne brhat* (iii 5 11² et al. O omits the last two words), *yābhīr dadāsi dāgushe* (iii 3 11⁵ G M omit *dāgushe*), *dadhāsi dāgushe kave* (iv 2 7²), and *agvam ā varṭayāsi nah* (vii 4 20). *Yijāsi* I have noted in two or three other passages, if the rest occur elsewhere, I have overlooked them. This leaves unaccounted for *jghāsi*, which is declared to occur "in another text," in the passage *prathame jghāsi*

दस्सनाभ्योदस्सोभिर्दस्संवृषदस्शोदस्शुकादस्द्राभ्यां परः

॥ १९ ॥

19 In *dañsanābhyaḥ*, *dañsobhīh*, *dañsam*, *vrshadāñśah*, *dañśukā*, and *dañśhtrābhyaṁ*, *anusvāra* is taken in the latter place

The commentator's citations are *vārgvānasya dañsanābhyaḥ* (i 5 11¹), *sayoshāv agvinaḥ dañsobhīh* (v 6 4¹), to which is added as counter-example, proving the need of the *-bhīh*, *yushmāko* "ti *ri-cādasah* (iv 3 18³ O has only the last word, and G M begin

18 ¹ *cakāro nishedhākarshakah rjāshyabhrīshu*² *grahane-shu*³ *nā* ⁴ *'nusvārāgamah syāt akāro ekāro kārī ā* (xvi 14) *iti prāp-tih bahusvaratvād*⁵ *eshu*⁶ *pūrvasūtranishedhō*⁷ *na sūdhyaṭi*⁸ *'ty atrā*⁹ *'yam ārambhah yathā*¹⁰ *tena*.... *achā*.... *jghāsi*¹¹ *'ti śākhāntare*¹² *prathame jghāsi*¹³ *'ti*¹⁴ *ā*.... *haviṣhā*.... *yābhīr*.... *dadhāsi*.... *agvam*....

¹ O ins an enumeration of the words in the rule ² G M -*ri* ³ O om ⁴ G M *radā* ⁵ B *esha*, G M om ⁶ G M -*tre m*, W B *āhān* ⁷ O om *atra* ⁸ G M O om ⁹ G M *ānsi* ⁽¹⁰⁾ O om, W *prathame* — — — (as being illegible in the MS from which the copy was made), B *-ghāsati*

19 ¹ *dañsanābhya ityādīshu*² *grahaneshe para evā*³ *'nusvārā-gamo bhavati*⁴ *yathā*⁵ *vārgv*.... *say*.... *bhīr* *iti kim yushm*.... ⁶ *puruḍ*.... *vrsh*.... *paśān*.... *dañśh*.... *dañse* *'ty etdvatār*⁷ *'vā*⁸ *'lam kim akhilapadapāthena*⁹ *kur*

with *ūti*), *pruḍaṅṣaṅ sanam* (iv 2 4³), *vrshadaṅṣus te dhātuh* (v 5 12) there is another case at v 5 21, *paṅān daṅṣukāh syu yad vishācinam* (v 2 9⁶ O omits the first word, and it alone has the last two), and *daṅṣhtrābhyām nalinīmān* (iv 1 10²) there is another case at v 7 11 To the objection that the citation in the rule of *daṅṣa* simply might have saved the rehearsal of whole words [in a part of the cases given], the commentator replies by quoting *kurvato me mo 'pa dasat* (i 6 3³ et al) as an example of cases which need to be excluded The addition of *puah*, 'in the latter place,' is because *vrshadaṅṣah* contains two places at which, by xv 4, the *anusvāra* would otherwise require to be inserted

This last point, however, does not pass (except in O) without further question and discussion The objection is raised that the mere citation of *vrshadaṅṣa* without *anusvāra* before the former sibilant is enough to settle its reading, according to the same principle that was appealed to under rule 13, for *hrasīyā*, *rasīyā*, and so on This is undeniable, and the only real answer to be made is that there was no harm in adding *para* here, to make the matter sure, while it could not have been employed in rule 13 without occasioning a great deal of additional trouble The commentator, however, prefers to have recourse to a plea of exceptionally puerile character In xv 4 (the rule here in force), he says, the spirants in general are implied, but in xvi 1 (in force at rule 13) a special spirant, *s*, and it is an acknowledged principle that, as between a generality and a specification, the specification is the more powerful That being the case, the putting down of that

rato--- *ityādāu mā bhūḍ iti 'para iti kim vrshadaṅṣa ity atra' sṭhānadvaye 'pi srāḍishu cār 'kapada* (xv 4) *iti pīṭtāu sūtyām pūrvatī' nā bhūḍ iti nānu grahanasāmānthyād evā 'nusvādīh¹⁰ pūrvatra nu bhuvati yathā hrasīyāvrasīyā* (xvi 13) *ityādāu grahanasāmānthyād¹¹ upapādītum nā 'sha doṣah srāḍishu cār 'kapada* (xv 4) *ity atro 'shmusāmānīyam uktum atha sakāraparā* (xvi 1) *ity atra tu tadviśeṣa uktah sāmānyaviśeṣayor viśeṣo balavān iti nyāyah tathā sūti¹² balavad-bāhīhanam¹¹ eva bhūṣhanam¹⁴ na tu¹⁴ durbalubādhānam¹⁵ iti¹² tatcār 'va grahanasāmānthyān¹⁶ samarthānīyam na ti¹⁷ atī¹⁷ durbalasthāne tathā 'pi¹⁸ adhīkuḥ²⁰ puruṣho virodhinam²¹ adhīkam eva bādhatē bhūṣhanatvāt na tu kadācid alpabalam²² iti²³ paraḥḥḍaprayoga²⁴ upapadyate⁷*

¹ O prefixes a separate rehearsal of the words in the rule ² G M *ā* ³ G M *syat* ⁴ in W only ⁵ O ins *ity atra 'py ākuraḍi* (i 2) *iti vacanād anusvaramah syat tam mā bhūḍ iti* ⁶ G M *-īhanena* (i) O om ⁸ W *ava* ⁹ W *-rva* ¹⁰ B *ragamah* ¹¹ W *samarthyagrahanam* (17) W *balavatīyam eva bhūṣhanam vādhanam eva bhūṣhanam na tu durbalam iti bādhanam* ¹² G M *-vatsadh*, B *-āham* (14) G M om ¹⁵ G M *-lasādhānam na sadhv* ¹⁶ W *nam eva samarthīyam*, B *-rīthya* ¹⁷ B *arīthi* ¹⁸ G M *hi* ¹⁹ G M *ins loke* ²⁰ W *adh*, G M *ka* ²¹ W *-dhanam* ²² W B *apy alpam* ²³ B *iti 'ti* ²⁴ W B *atra rād*

which is powerful, not of that which is weak, is honorific, hence, the competency of the citation was to be insisted on in the former rule, but not here, in a weak position. Moreover, a superior man puts down, for honor's sake, a mighty opponent, but never a weak one. Therefore, the use of the word *para* here is right and proper!

All the MSS except B (and G M, which have a slight lacuna, involving the word) read *dañsan* instead of *dañsam* in the rule

मन्स्येमन्सतैयन्सद्यन्सन्वन्सतेवन्सगः ॥ २० ॥

20 Also in *mañsyē*, *mañsatāi*, *yañsad*, *yañsan*, *vañsate*, and *vañsagah*

The commentator quotes as follows *paçūn nā 'bhi mañsya iti* (iii 1 9⁶), *anu nāu çāru mañsatāi bhadrā indrasya rātayah* (vii 4 15). O alone has the first two words, B alone the last one), *çocishā yañsad viçvam ny atinam* (iv 6 1⁵). G M O omit *çocishā*, *ishavah çarma yañsan* (iv 6 6⁴), *agnir no vañsate rayam* (iv 6 1⁵), and *tiçmagrñgo na vañsagah* (ii 6 11⁴). The words here dealt with occur only in the passages quoted, except *yañsat*, which is found also at iv 1 11², 7 14³. To the objection that it would have been enough to give *mañs*, *yañs*, and *vañs* (the MSS leave it doubtful whether these are the precise forms suggested) in the rule, instead of citing whole words, the commentator replies by giving the counter examples *uttamasyā 'va dyati* (vi 3 10⁴), *yasya bhūyāñso yajñakratavah* (iii 1 7³), and *adya vasu vasati* (ii 5 3⁷).

उन्न वन्शम् ॥ २१ ॥

21 Also in *vañçam*, after *ut* or *na*

The passages are *ud vañçam va yenire* (i 6 12³. W has dropped out *yenire*, along with all the rest of the comment) and *prācinavañçam karoti* (vi 1 1¹ twice). A counter-example, with a different preceding word, is *brahmavarçasy eva bhavati vaçam vā eshu carati* (ii 1 7⁷ only O has the first two words, and it omits the last two).

20 ¹ *mañsya ityādīshu² syād anusvārāgamah yathā³ paçūn*
 ---- *anu*---- *çoc*---- *ishavah*---- *agnir*---- *tiçm*----
 ---- ⁴ *mañs yañs vañs* ⁴ *ity etāvatāi 'vā 'lam kim akhila-*
padapāthēna utt---- *yasya*---- *adya*---- *ityādīr mā bhād*
iti

¹ O prefixes a separate rehearsal of the words in the rule. ² B -*di*. ³ G M O om. ⁴ W *bhadrāyañs*, B *sanisur yams vams* G M *manisa yañsa vamsa*, O *mañse yañse vañse*

21 *ut¹ na ity evampūrve² vañçam ity asmin grahane syād*
anusvārāgamah ud---- *'prā* -- *'evampūrva iti⁴ kim*
brahmin---- ³

¹ O *uñsyatebhvat*. ² W *rvo*, B *rva*. ³ W om. ⁴ O *unne* 'ti

अक्र॑स्तक्र॑स्यतेर॑स्यतेभ्र॑शते ॥ २२ ॥

22 Also in *akraṇsta*, *kraṇsyate*, *aṇsyate*, and *bhraṇcate*

The passages are *dyām vāgy ā 'kraṇsta* (vii 5 19¹), *utkraṇsyate svāhā* (vii 1 19²), *uparaṇsyate svāhā* (vii 1 19¹ B O omitt), and *nā 'smād rāshtram bhraṇcate* (v 7 4⁴ O omits the first two words), *bhraṇcate* occurs also at i 6 11¹ twice

G M read *utkraṇsyate* for *kraṇsyate* in the rule

र॑स्यै च ॥ २३ ॥

23 And also in *raṇhyā*

The only passage is *pūshno raṇhyā* (i 3 10²) The significance of the *ca*, 'and,' which is here out of its proper place, will be given, we are told, under the next rule

ऐकार॑ उव्यस्य॑ नितान्तः॑ ॥ २४ ॥

24 The *āi*, according to Ukhyā, is excessive

That is to say, according to the commentator, the *āi* of the word *raṇhyā*, here brought forward by the *ca*, 'and,' which is read in the preceding rule *Nitānta*, 'excessive,' is explained as signifying 'uttered with more violent effort' The whole business is a very queer one—Ukhyā's opinion itself, its introduction here at a place where it is entirely impertinent, and the bit of interpretation whereby it is worked into the connection

विरि॑त्रि संख्या॑सु ॥ २५ ॥

25 Also in *vi*, *ri*, and *tri*, in numerals, except in *su*

22 ¹*akraṇste* ²*tyādeshu* *syād anusvārāgamah*¹ *dyām* ----
utkr ---- ²*upa* - - - ² *nā* ----

(¹) O substitutes a separate rehearsal of the words in the rule (except the last), and *eteshu gāhaneshu anusvārāgamo bhavati* (²) B O om

23 *raṇhyā ity asmin grahane syād anusvārāgamah pūshno*
---- *cahārasya* ¹*vyatihā*, ²*enā* ¹*nva* ¹*uttarasūte prayojanam*
ucyate

(¹) G M *vyavaharād anwayād*

24 *raṇhyā ity asmin*¹ *grahane pūvasūtrasthacahārasanar-*
pitā ānkāro nātānto bhavati ²*ty*³ *ukhyasya*⁴ *mate*⁵ *nātāntas tivrā-*
taraprayatna ity arthah

nā ¹*tan matam iṣṭam*

¹ G M om ² B -*tyasya cak*-, O -*treprayasthacah* , G M *pite* ³ G M om
ti ⁴ W *ukhyā*, O *ukhyasyā* ⁵ *caryasyu* ⁵ O *tam*

The syllable *su* is here, the commentator tells us, the ending of the locative case, just as *ah* (at 123) is used as representing the nominative case. This remark is called for, because (see the example below) the actual form in which the syllable appears in the cases aimed at is *shu*. We have a right to be surprised at finding it given as *su* in the rule, and perhaps, also, to conjecture that *samkhyāsu* was originally simply the locative plural of *samkhyā*, and that the other value was interpreted into it when the cases calling for exception were noticed.

The quoted examples are *viñcatyā svāhā* (vii 2 13 et al. O omits), *yad viñcatu dve tena virāpāu* (v 3 3³ G M omit the last two words, O the last three), *catvārvīñgate svāhā* (vii 2 17 G M O omit *svāhā*, B has dropped out *-te svāhā*, the next example, and the first word of the next but one), *triñgate svāhā* (vii 2 17 O omits *svāhā*), and *triñcat trayas ca* (14 11¹), there are other cases, which I have not taken the trouble to collect. The inclusion of *tri* in the rule, the commentator says, is for the sake of greater plainness, since *tri*, of course, involves *tri* also, it is to be compared with the inclusion of the *v* of *vāghā* in rule vii 13. Begging the commentator's pardon, however, the two cases are not at all analogous, and the citation of *tri* and *tri* together must be esteemed an oversight, and an offense against the law of economy of expression, obligatory in the *sūtra*-style. The need of restriction to numerals is illustrated by *vice jandya* (ii 5 12³), *su rishah pātu naktam* (12 14⁷ et al. G M O omit *naktam*), and *trishṭubhāi 'vā 'smāi* (ii 5 10¹ et al.). Finally, the specification "not before *su*" is established by *trishv ā rocane divah* (iv 2 4⁴ et al. O omits *divah*), if there is another case of this kind, I have failed to note it.

There is yet another word, *trishāhasāh* (v 6 8³, p. *tri-sāhasrah*), which would properly fall under this rule, but is exempted by a pregnant interpretation of the word *ekapade* in xv 4 (see the note to that rule).

शिश्नुमारः शिष्पत्संश्वासश्चासंस्तृष्टसंस्कृत्यसंस्कृतसंशितसंशिताकिंशिलकिंशिला ॥ २६ ॥

25 *vi ri tri* ¹ *evampūrva śhmaparo* ² *'nusvārāgamah*³ *syāt ebhur yadi⁴ samkhyo 'cyate⁵ asu⁶ sugabdam varjayitvā⁷ sū⁸ saptamī vibhaktir uktā⁹ yathā¹⁰ 'hārah¹¹ prathamā vibhaktir upalīkshanam¹² viñ-.... yad-.... catv-.... ¹⁰ triñ-.... ¹⁰ triñ-gat-.... triṅghanam vispashtārtham¹¹ yato¹² vīm samkhyā¹³ 'sv ity¹² etāvatai¹⁴ 'vā¹⁵ 'lam yathā¹⁶ vāghāshapurva¹⁷ (vii 13) ity atra vakāro vispashtārthah¹⁸ samkhye¹⁹ 'ti kum vice- - sa-.... trishṭ-.... asv iti kum trishv-....*

¹ G M O ins *ity* ² B *ukarap-* ³ G M *-ra āg-* ⁴ G M *yadd* ⁵ O *'cyeta*
⁶ W *a* ⁷ G M *sv it*, O *su it* ⁸ B *ak-*, G M *āk-* ⁹ O *-kter up-* ¹⁰ B *om*
¹¹ G M *om* ¹² O *om*

26 Also in *viñcumāraḥ*, *cñshat*, *sañvā*, *sañsrā*, *sañsrśī'a*, *sañskṛtya*, *sañskṛta*, *sañcita*, *sañcitā*, *kiñcila*, and *kiñcilā*

The passages, as quoted, are *sindhoḥ viñcumāro hinavataḥ* (v 5 11 only O has the last word), *kim tata uc cñshatī 'ti yad dha anyeshatakāḥ* (v 5 5² only O has the last two words, and it omits the first two), *ubhayataḥsañcivāy kunyād avadāyā 'bhi* (u 6 8⁴ only O has the last two words, and it leaves off *ubhayataḥ*), *sañsrāvabhāgā stha* (1 1 13²), *sañsrśtagit somapāhi* (iv 6 4¹ W B put this after the next following example, see farther on), *garuram eva sañskṛtyā 'bhyārohati* (v 6 6^{3 4} O omits the first two words, and all but O omit the last one, thus making a citation which is also found again in v 6 6⁴), *tan nuḥ sañskṛtam* (1 4 43²), *brahmasañcito hy eśha ghrāhavanah* (u 5 9² only O has the last word), *garavye brahmasañcitā* (iv 6 4⁴), *kiñcila vanya yā ta ishuh* (v 5 9¹ all but G M end with *te*), and *kiñcilaḥ caturtho vanyah* (v 5 9² G M alone have *vanyah*) and *kiñcīlāya ca kshayanāya ca* (iv 5 9¹ O ends with the first *ca*). The commentary prefaces the last two passages with the remark that the second citation of *kiñcila* is that of a part of a word, including a variety of cases. But this, in the first place, would imply that the reading of the rule at the end was *kiñcīlakiñcila* which is the case only in T, and, in the second place, even were that the reading, the explanation would be a bad one, and the repeated *kiñcila* should be defined as a theme ending in *a*, and so including the declensional forms of that theme, by 1 22 in fact, it was expressly cited under that rule, as an example of its application. If *kiñcīlā* is the true reading (as I presume to be the case), then we must suppose that the makers of the rule intended both words as *padārkaḍeṣa*'s, the one involving the first two examples quoted, the other the third, and the case being quite parallel with that of *sañcita* and *sañcitā*, just preceding but the comment has discovered a difficulty, namely, that *kiñcila* is actually a *pada* in the text (v 5 9¹), and therefore cannot be quoted without ceremony as a *padārkaḍeṣa* (see under rule 29, where this is more distinctly brought out), and hence its efforts to amend the reading and interpretation—efforts in which it is too intent upon the end to be gained to be mindful of consistency in the means employed. In short, here as in many other places, the Pratiçākhya is less minutely accurate in its modes of statement than the commentator would fain have it, and he undertakes to make it what it should be by forced interpretation.

26 ¹ *viñcumāra ityādigrāhaneshu² syād anusvārāgamah ya-
thā³ sindhoḥ.... kim.... ubhay.... sañsr.... sañsr-
.... gar-.... tan.... brahm.... ⁴ gar.... kiñc-
.... parakiñcīlagrahanam⁵ padārkaḍeṣatayā bahūpādānār-
tham kiñcilaḥ.... kiñcīlāya.... nonu⁶ sañsrśte 'ty atra
shakāraparo 'nusvārāganah kim na syāt māi 'vam atra sūtre
sarvatra⁷ padādivarnānantaram⁸ evā 'nusvāradaśanāt tatsāha-*

Cases of various character are here intermingled. The first two and the last are indivisible words, of which the *anusvāra* forms an essential part, as of those cited in rules 19 and 20, or 29 and 30. The others come from combinations with the preposition *saṁ*, and are of two classes *saṁskṛtya* and *saṁskṛta* the *pada*-text does not attempt to analyze, although (see v 6,7) it divides *saṁskṛute* and *saṁskṛvata*, ejecting the intrusive sibilant those remaining are compounds with *saṁ* which enter into further composition, so that their compound character does not appear in the *pada*-text. And one or two cases of this last class seem to have been overlooked by the makers of the treatise they are *svādushaṁśadah* (iv 6 6³, p *svādu saṁśadah*) and *strīshaṁśadam* (ii 5 1⁵, p *strī-saṁśadam*). The former of them, indeed, is noticed in G M, which introduce *saṁśadah* into the rule, after *saṁskṛta*, and quote the compound in the comment—seeming to betray their consciousness that the word is not a part of the ordinary reading of the rule by saying “when *saṁśadah* is read, the instance is *svādushaṁśadah*”

There are further varieties of reading in the rule. G M have *saṁśṛṣṭa*, W B put *saṁśṛṣṭa* between *saṁskṛtya* and *saṁskṛta*, and give its example a corresponding place among the examples, T B G M read *saṁskṛtaṁ*, which is perhaps to be preferred, other differences are mere copyists' errors, and not worth reporting.

So far as I have discovered, *saṁskṛtam* (i 2 9) and *saṁṣṭa* (iv 6 4⁴ a second time) are the only words included in this rule which occur further in the *Sanhitā*.

The commentator raises the question whether we must not suppose that an *anusvāra* is also to be inserted before the spirant *śh* in *saṁśṛṣṭa*, but, without this time appealing to the “competency of the citation” to settle the reading, replies that, the word being associated here with others all of which have *anusvāra* only after the first vowel, we must assume the same to be the case with it also, all but O adding that “there is no reason for inconsistency” in this respect.

सितृद्वहकारपरः ॥ २७ ॥

27 Also after *si*, *tr*, or *dr*, when *h* follows

The quoted examples are *siṁho vayah* (iv 3 5), *ṣatatarhāṁśa trāṁ hanti* (i 5 7⁶ et al), and *dr̥ṇhasva mā hvāh* (i 1 3 et al). Of the

caryād⁹ atrā⁹ pi tathā¹⁰ va¹⁰ vyñeyam¹¹ na vāparīṭye kāraṇam asti¹¹

¹ O prefixes a separate rehearsal of the words cited in the rule. ² G M *dishu gr*, O *-dishu*. ³ G M O om. ⁴ G M ins *sansada uti pāthe svādushaṁśadah*. ⁵ W *param ki-*. ⁶ G M om. ⁷ W G M *sarva*. ⁸ W *varn*, G M *-nāṁcaram*. ⁹ O *sāh-*. ¹⁰ B *vā⁹ pi*. ⁽¹¹⁾ O om, W om *na*.

27 *si tr dr ity evampārvo hākāraparāḥ¹ syād anusvārā-gamah² yathā³ siṁho.... ṣatat-.... dr̥ṇh-....⁴ evam-*

noun *śāṅha*, and of forms from the roots *trñh* and *drñh*, which alone come under the action of the rule, there are other cases in the Sanhitā. Counter-examples are given (excepting in O) to show that no other syllables take the increment before *h*, *sapatnasāhī śrāhā* (12 12² but G M substitute *sapatnasāhī sam māṅmi*, 11 10¹) and *anatrādhāyo 'rāca* (v 2 10³), that *r* takes the increment only when preceded by *t* or *d*, *grhānām usamanīyā* (11 3 8²), that the increment is taken only before *h*, *sishāsantīh* (vii 5 2¹ G M read *sishāsah*, but doubtless by a blunder only), *trshvīm anu* (12 14¹), and *naktam drce dīpyate* (v 6 4⁴)

मक्षिष्ठस्य च ॥ २८ ॥

28 As also, in *mañhishthasya*

That is to say, before the *h*, which is brought down from the preceding rule by *ca*, expressly in order to exclude the assumption of *anusvāra* before the *sh* and *s* in the same word. The passage is *mañhishthasya prabhrtasya* (1v 2 3⁴), and there is no other

•आदिरःकृतिरःहोऽःहोरःहोमुगत्यःहाम्रःकृसोऽःक-
साःशमःशुभिरःशमुवाःश्चःशूत्रःशवोऽःशुरःशुमःशू-
नःशुनाःशोरःशायोपाःश्चःशौ ॥ २९ ॥

29 Also, after the first vowel, in *añhatih*, *añhah*, *añhoh*, *añ homuc*, *atyañhāh*, *añhasah*, *añhasā*, *añcam*, *añcubhīh*, *añcabhuvā*, *añcu*, *añcū*, *añcavah*, *añcūh*, *añcum*, *añcūn*, *añcundā*, *añcosh*, *añ cāya*, *upañcu*, and *añcāu*

We have here a detailed list of complete *padas* (or, in one or two instances, more than a whole *pada*), in which *anusvāra* is found. The illustrative examples are as follows. For *añhatih*, *pari dveshaso añhatih* (11 6 11²) the only case. For *añhah*, *añ-homucam vrshabham yajñvyānām* (16 12⁴, p *añhah-mucam* G M O omit the last word), *añhah* is found four or five times in the Sanhitā as an independent word, and about fifteen times in the

parva iti kim sup---- *anatr-----* *rkārenār 'vā⁵ 'lam kim*
takāradakārābhyām grh----- *evampuru iti kim sish-----*
trshvīm----- *naktam . . .⁴ hakārāh pa o yasmad⁶ asāu hakā-*
rāparah⁶

¹ G M *raç ca* ² O *asau hekarāparah* ³ B G M O om ⁽⁴⁾ O om ⁵ G M om *eva* ⁶ G M *sa tathoktah*

28 *mañhishthasye 'ty asmin grahane cakārākrshṭahakārāpa o*
'nusvārāgamo bhuvati¹ yuthā² mañh----- *³cakārāh kimar-*
thah atrā¹ 'va grahane sashakārāpa o mā bhūd iti³

¹ G M O *syāt* ² G M O om ⁽³⁾ O om

compound *añhomuc*—one of the forms of which, as we shall see farther on, has to be made separate account of. For *añho*, *añho* *cū yā* (1 4 22 and 11 1 11⁴) there is no other case. For *añhomuk*, *añhomrugbhyaṃ dvikapāluh* (vii 5 22 O omits *dvikapāluh*, and W B put it in out of place), of all the forms of *añhomuc*, this is the only one in which *añhak* does not form a *pada* (it is divided, of course, *añhomuk-bhyaṃ*), and which therefore is not disposed of by the citation of *añhak*. For *atyañhāh*, *rtapāc cā 'tyañhāh* (1 8 13^{2 3}) the word is found again at iv 6 5⁵, it is more than a simple *pada* (p *ati-añhāh*), and the *ati* is included in the citation, we are told, to prevent confusion of *añhāh* with *ahāh* in such phrases as *shadaha bhavanti* (vii 5 1⁴, *shat-ahāh*). For *añhasah*, *te no muñcatam añhasah* (iv 7 15⁶ all except B read *muñcantv*, which does not occur before *añhasah*) of this case of *añhas* I have noted about twenty instances. For *añhasā*, the only example is the one quoted, *añhasā vā esha grhītaḥ* (11 4 2³ O ends with *vā*). The commentator next raises the question why whole *padas* should have been cited, when *añha* (as part of a word) would have been sufficient to assure the reading, and replies by quoting *sa rasam aha vasantāya* (vii.2 10¹ O begins with *aha*), as an example of cases that required to be excluded. For *añṣum*, *pari paṣyāmo 'ñṣum ā* (vii 1 6² O omits *ā*) the form is found again in the same division. For *añṣubhīh*, *śubdhīh añṣubhīh pavayati* (vi 4 5⁷ O omits *yavayati*, W B put this example off until after that for *añṣu*, which would be, to be sure, a more suitable place for it, if the same order were followed in the rule, but there all authorities agree see further on). For *añṣabhuvā*, *vayā 'ñṣabhuvā somam* (vi 4 8² G M O omit *somam*) the word is found again at vi 4 8³. For *añṣu*, *tend 'ñṣumat* (111 2 2¹), and it is pointed out that, by rule 1 53 (the comment blunderingly quotes 1 52 instead), *anañṣu kurvanti* (111 2 2¹) is involved with *añṣu* (O has lost, of this, all but the example *anañṣu ku*). For *añṣū*, *vrshno hy etāv añṣū* (vi 4 5³). For *añṣavah*, *pānā vā añṣavah* (vi 4 4⁴). For *añṣuh*, *añṣum añṣus te* (12 11¹ et al) the word is found in eight other passages. For *añṣum*, *yam ādityā añṣum āpyāyanti* (11 3 5³ et al only W has the last word) there are five other instances. For *añṣān*, *añṣān apa grhīti* (vi 4 4⁴ lost in W) it occurs further in the

29 ¹ *añhatih*----- *eteshv ādū*² *musvārāgamo*³ *bhavati*⁴ *ya-
thā*⁵ *pari*----- *añho*---- *'sātre samhitāyām otvavīdhānād'
ahar*---- *ityādāu na syād ayam vidhiḥ kintu yasmin visar-
janīyo repham nā* *'padyate tasyāi* *'vo* *'pādānum* ⁸ *añho*----- ⁸
*'nanv ayam*¹⁰ *cāi*¹¹ *'kabandhak rephaprāptusyāi*¹² *'yam vidhiḥ
vhitānusvārasyāi* *'vā*¹³ *rephamishedhate*¹⁴ *'ti nā* *'yam dośhak
siddhasyāi* *'vā* ¹⁵ *'musvārasya bodhanam*¹⁶ *nu tu vidhiḥ iti*¹⁷ *añ-
hom*----- ¹⁸ *rtap*----- *atī* *'ti krm shad*----- *te*----- *añ-
hasā*----- ¹⁸ *añhe* *'ty*¹⁸ *etāvātā*¹⁹ *siddhe*²⁰ *sakalapadapāṭhaḥ km-
arthak*²¹ *sa rasam*----- *iti*²² *nishedhārthak puri* ... ²³ *shad*

same division, and in no other. For *añṣunā*, *añṣunā te añṣu* (1 2 6 G M O end with *te*). For *añṣoh*, *yo vā añṣor āyatanam veda* (vi 6 10² O omits the last two words, and B has lost the whole example, with most of the preceding one). For *añṣāya*, *añṣāya svāhā bhagāya* (18 13³ G M omit *bhagāya*). For *upāñṣu*, *upāñṣusavāno yad upāñṣusavanam* (vi 44¹ O omits the first two words). The word *upāñṣu*, when not further compounded, is separated in *padu*-text into *upa-añṣu*, and so most of its forms come under the various citations of the cases of *añṣu* already illustrated (thus, it furnishes additional instances, not counted above, to *añṣu*, *añṣuh*, *añṣum*, and *añṣoh*, twenty in all), but in its compounds it makes, of course, a single *pada* of itself (thus, *upāñṣu-savanah*), and so has to be cited in the rule as such (we have other combinations, namely, with *pātra*, *yāya*, and *antayāma*), and, moreover, we have one case, *upāñṣāu*, showing a form of *añṣu* which does not appear independently, and so furnishing the final citation, for which the example is *tam upāñṣāu sam asthāpayan* (vi 46¹) there is another in the same division.

The restriction *ādih*, 'after the first vowel,' is intended to guard against any one's imagining that the *s* of *añṣasah* and so on is to be preceded by *anusvāra*.

What has thus been given represents the whole comment as found in O, the other MSS make two or three troublesome additions, to which it is necessary to return. The last of them regards the citation of *añṣu* and its inflectional forms (namely, those that contain *añṣu* as a part, or *añṣubhih*, *añṣuh*, *añṣum*, *añṣunā*), and, if I understand it aright, it asserts that, if *añṣu* alone were cited the other forms would not be included, because *añṣu* itself occurs as a *pada* (and would therefore have to be taken as such, and not as a part of a word, *padārkaḍeṣa*), and if it be proposed to cite it with each value, as was done with *kiñṣula* (in rule 26 see note to that rule), there remains the difficulty that, as a phonetic complex only, it would involve such cases as *paṣum paṣupate te adyu* (iii 14¹ W omits *paṣum*)—where, namely, we have the same elements in combination, only without the *anusvāra*. With regard to *añṣa*, a somewhat similar statement appears to be made namely, that if *añṣu* simply were quoted, it would be understood as a *pada* (being such in *añṣa-bhuvā*), and hence *añṣam* would

----²³ *tvayā*...²⁴ *bhūve 'ti kam añṣe 'ty etāvātā²⁵ grāhane tathāvidhāpadasadbhāvāt añṣum²⁶ ity atru na²⁷ syāt²⁴ tenā*
----²⁸ *apy akārādī* (152) *iti vacanād anañṣu*... *ity apy²⁹ udāharanam²⁸ vṛshno*... *prānā*...³⁰ *añṣur*...³¹ *yum*
----³¹ *añṣūn*...³¹ *añṣunā*... *yo*... *añṣāya*...
upāñṣu... *tam*...³² *añṣo³³ ity³⁴ etāvātā³⁵ grhīta itareshām aparigraha³⁶ syāt³⁷ tathāvidhāpadasadbhāvāt atho 'bhayam grhyate padam ekadeṣa³⁸ en kiñṣulanat tathā sati padārkaḍeṣe shu paṣum*... *ityādīshu p. āpnuyād anusvārū³⁹ tuc cā 'nsh-*

not be included. The comment, however, puts this forward as a reason for including the *bhuvā* of *añgabhuva*, which, according to the interpretation here offered, it would not be, and perhaps my comprehension of the argument is insufficient. I do not see any reason why, if the *pada*-text divides *añga-bhuvā*, the *bhuvā* should be given in the rule. Equally unexplainable to me is the special citation of *añgubhuh*, which, being divided in *pada* into *añgu-bhuh*, falls under *añgu* we have also in the *Sanhita* *añgubhyām* (1 4 2 and vi 4 5³), which is a case analogous with the other, and ought to be treated like it. Possibly we may infer from the unsuitable position of *añgubhuh* in the rule, and from the place of its example as given in W B, next after that containing *añgu-mat* (as if it were, like the latter, a case of *añgu*), that it has been interpolated, by an awkward and blundering hand, but the conjecture is a more daring one than I venture seriously to make.

The first *excursus* of the comment is in connection with the second citation, *añhuh*. Since the *sanhitā*-form of this word, we are told, appears by the rule itself to be *añho*, the rule does not apply to *ahah*, which shows a different result of combination in *ahar devānām* (1 5 9² G M read *aharahar*, which is not found in the *Sanhitā* before *devānām*), but only to a word the *visarga-niya* of which does not become *i*. This seems plausible enough, but what shall we say of the *ahuh* which appears in *sanhitā* as *aho* in *ahobhyām*, *ahobhuh*, and *ahorātre* (p. *ahah* *ātre*)⁹. Either the makers of the treatise overlooked these words, or they did not attribute to the form *añho* in the rule the significance which is here claimed for it.

The remaining passage is more obscure to me than any of the others. In G M, it is both preceded and followed by the examples for *añhoh* and *añhomuk*, in W B, these examples precede it, excepting the last word of the second, which comes after it. I imagine that its true place is between the two, and that its intent is to turn against the rule the argument just pleaded respecting *añhah*, pointing out that, as *añhoh* becomes *añho* in the rule, it ought not to exhibit *anusvāra* except when occurring in that phonetic form: the objection being then evaded by the plea that the form is given merely as it happens to occur, and not with any

tam^{8a} *ādur* *iti* *kim* *sarveshu* *sthāneshu* *nā* *bhūḍ* *iti* *yathā*¹⁰
'*n*hasa *ityādi*

¹ O ins *ādih* ² G M *svarād* ³ G M *gamaḥ* ⁴ G M *bhagute* ⁵ O om
(⁶) O om ⁷ G M *otvāsyā* ⁸ MSS ins *añhomugbhyām* (⁹) O om ¹⁰ W *aya*
¹¹ G M *ca* ¹² W B *ekapr-* ¹³ G M om *eva* ¹⁴ W B *pham na-* (¹⁵) W
'*anusvarah* *syat* *nodhayaṇa* *syāt* *tu* *vādur* *iti* *dvikapilāḥ*, B ' *anusvāra* *syat* *bodh*
yata *namu* *vādur* *iti* *dvikapilāḥ* ¹⁶ G M *uśbodhnam* ¹⁷ G M *ity* *anho* *cid*
ya (¹⁸) W *añh*, B *aty* ¹⁹ G M *-atir* *'va* ²⁰ O *dheh*, B *dheh* *kutah* ²¹ W
kim, B om ²² B *ity* *atrā* *'pi*, G M *ityādi*, O *ityādi* (²³) W B put next
before *apy* *ukarādi* ²⁴ O om ²⁵ G M *-vad* ²⁶ W B *aṣum* ²⁷ W B om
(²⁸) O *anañgu* *ku* simply ²⁹ W om (³⁰) G M put before *mshno* (³¹) W om
(³²) O om ³³ W *añg* *'ty*, G M *añg* *'ty* ³⁴ B *vātā* ³⁵ B *upavagrha*, G M
apī *grahanaḥ* ³⁶ G M ins *kūḥam* ³⁷ G M *-deṣam* ³⁸ G M *riḡamah*
⁴⁰ W O *a*

intent of prescription. But I have too little confidence in the correctness of this conjecture to be led to attempt amending the text into giving it consistent expression.

अवग्रह उदात्तो ऽन्सेऽन्सायाऽन्साभ्यामन्साविति ॥३०॥

30 Also in *añse*, *añsāya*, *añsābhyām* and *añsāu*, when accented on the first syllable

The term *avagraha* is declared by the commentator to be equivalent here to *ādī* or *padādi*, 'beginning of the word'. This is, of course, wholly and entirely inadmissible, except as we are driven by the irresistible force of circumstances to give it that meaning or none. There has evidently been some blunder committed, but we can hardly venture to attempt its rectification. Not one of the words here cited occurs, or could occur, as *avagraha*, 'former member of a compound'. The restriction is made with reference to *añsāu* alone, in order to distinguish it from *asāu*. The examples are *dukṣhne* 'ñsa upa *dudhāti* (v 3 1⁵ O omits *dudhāti*, W has lost the whole), *ṣṭyañsāya* (vi 3 17 W has lost *ṣṭy*), *añsābhyām svāhā* (vi 3 16²), and *uttane* 'ñsāu ca *piṇḍi* *dudhāti* (v 3 1⁵ O reads *tshtthati* for *dudhāti*, but doubtless by a copyist's error only), the counter-example is *asāu abruv* *citra-vikṛtā* (ii 5 2⁵ O omits the last word), *añsābhyām* alone is found more than once in the text (namely, again at v 7 13)

नासावा नामावा ॥३१॥

31 But not in *asāu ā*

There is a single passage where the pronoun *asāu*, in the vocative case, stands at the beginning of a clause, and is, accordingly, accented on the first syllable, hence the necessity of the present rule, establishing an exception under its predecessor. The passage is *brāyā'd asāu ē 'hī' 'ty evām evā* (ii 4 9³ O alone has *eva*, G M omit also *evam*, and B blunderingly reads instead of it *atra*)

The Pratiśakhya's rehearsal of the cases of interior *anusi āru* is,

30 *avagraha ādir ity arthah yudī padādī udātīh syāt tarhy añse* ¹..... *ity eteshu* ² *syād anusvāragamih itīcābdah svanā-pavācī dukṣhne* .. ³ *ṣṭy*.... *añsā*.... *uttane*....
ādir udātī itī kim asāv....

¹ B *pari* ⁽²⁾ W om ³ G M *shan*

31 *ādīyudātīe saty apy* ¹ *asāv e 'ty* ² *asman* ³ *grahane na khalu* ⁴ *syād anusvāragamih brāyā'd*....

iti tribhāṣhyaratne⁵ prātisākhyaṅvarane
śhodaso⁶ dhyāyah

¹ W *yady ud*, B *yady udattatve* ² B O om ⁽³⁾ W *asāv ut ty*, B *asau*, G M O *asav ity* ⁽⁴⁾ O om ⁵ B *priti* ⁶ G M O *dvitīyapragne catun tho*

so far as I have been able to discover, complete for the present Tāittirīya-Saṁhita, with the exception of the two compounds (*stri-shaṅśāda* and *svādushaṅśāda*) noticed under rule 26. Whether its rules are so drawn as to involve no cases that require to be excluded, is a much more difficult question, and one which my examination of the text has not been close enough to enable me to determine, but I have noted no instances of inaccuracy, unless the possible confusion of *aiḥah* and *ahah*, pointed out under rule 29, is to be so considered.

CHAPTER XVII

CONTENTS 1-4, opinions of various authorities, as to the degree of nasality in different nasal letters, 5, as to increase of quantity in connection with *anusvara*, 6, as to increased effort required by certain accents, 7-8, as to other more general matters of utterance

तीव्रतरमानुनासिक्यमनुस्वारोत्तमेष्विति शैत्यायनः ॥ १ ॥

1 Ġātyāyana says that the nasal quality is stronger in *anusvara* and the nasal mutes

We have here a chapter entirely composed of the cited opinions of certain specified authorities, and none of them of any definite value or importance in themselves, though interesting as affording us a glimpse of subjects to which the attention of the old Hindu phonetists was drawn, and to their hair-splitting and discordant speculations respecting them.

The commentator's exposition adds nothing to our comprehension of the rule. It quotes the rule at the end of the second chapter (ii 52) as to the cause of nasal quality, and tries (without good reason) to connect with it the present one. Examples of the stronger nasal utterance are given, as follows *agnīṅr upsushudāh*

1 'anusvāraḥ co'ttamāḥ' cā 'nusvārottamāḥ teshu tīvrataram bhavaty ānundāsikyam iti gātyāyano nāma munir manyate'. tīvrad adhikam tīvrataram ānundāsikatā² 'nundāsikyam nāsi-kāvvaranād ānundāsikyam (ii 52) ity asya vidheḥ prayatnadārḍhyam³ upadiśyate⁴ yathā⁵ agnīṅr---- 'tāṅs. -- martyaṅ----⁶ yam----⁷ vāñcate----⁸ maninā----⁹ ete-¹⁰ shv¹⁰ iti kum rukmam---- tiginam----¹⁰ suḥl----¹⁰

(1) O om (2) W -maḥ (3) W -sikā, B -sikāndam bhāvah (4) W O -darḥam, B -dārbyam, G M prāyadārthyam (5) O ms anusvārottamā ānundāsikā ity etāny ānundāsikāsthānāni anusvārottameshu tīvrataram ānundāsikyam bhavati gātyāyano nama manyate (6) G M O om (7) in O only (8) O prāh--- (9) O anusvārottameshu (10) O sa---- eteshu cā 'va tīvrataram

(v 6 1²), *yam kāmam kāmāyate* (vii 1 1² G M O substitute *yam kāmāyeta*, 16 10⁴ et al), *vañcate pavvañcate* (iv 5 3¹), and *minamā rūpānā'ndrena* (vii 3 14), but O introduces after the first *tāñs te dadhāmi* (iv 1 10³) and *martyāñ āvvega* (v 7 9¹), and substitutes for the last two *prāñ piā 'dravat* (v 7 10¹). Counter-examples, of the weaker utterance, are *rukham upa dadhāti* (v 2 7² but W substitutes, by an evident blunder, *kūrmam upa dadhāti*, v 2 8⁵), *tigman āyudham* (iv 7 15⁴), and *suplohāñs sumāñ-galāñs* (18 16²), O giving instead of the last *sa imam lokam* (15 9⁴), and spoiling the whole illustration by adding, "in these likewise it is stronger." The first two counter-examples are evidently given for the *yama* which, by xxi 12, is to be inserted between the mute and nasal in each the last is a case falling under xv 8, which prescribes nasalization of a protracted final *a*. The other nasal sounds are the *nāsikya* (xxi 14), and the nasal semivowels into which *m* and *n* are to be converted (v 26, 28) before *l*, *y*, and *v* these last are instanced by the phrase quoted in O alone.

The manuscript O follows an independent course in the exposition of this rule, as of the rest composing the chapter

‘समं सर्वत्रेति कौहलीपुत्रः ॥ २ ॥

2 Kāuhālīputra says that it is the same everywhere

The comment interprets *samam*, 'same,' as signifying here *tiv-rataram*, which it had explained above as an absolute rather than a relative comparative—'very excessive,' rather than 'more excessive.' That does not seem likely to be the real meaning. As examples, are cited, rather needlessly, *sañra ānāh* (iv 6 1¹ et al), *sanyattāh* (15 1¹ et al), *nyāñ agni cetavyah* (v 5 3² only O has *cetavyah*), and *upahātāñs ho* (11 6 7³). O gives an entirely different, though equivalent, exposition, and only the last two of these examples, with two others, namely *sarvāñ agniñr apsusha-dah* (v 6 1²) and *imān lokān* (11 1 3¹).

The name of the authority quoted is given by G M as Kāuhālīyaputra, and by O as Kohālīputra, in both the text and commentary

अनुस्वारे णिविति भारद्वाजः ॥ ३ ॥

3 Bhāradvāja says it is faint in *anusvāra*

2 *sarvatrā 'nunāsikavāneshu' tivrataratvam 'samam iti' kōu-hālīputro² manyate samr----- sāmy- --- nyāñ----- upa----- ityādi*

¹ W B *sikyav-*, G M *sikyam v* ⁽²⁾ W *sarvate 'ti* ³ G M (as also in the rule) *ivyap*

O substitutes for the whole *anusvārottamāneshu sarveshu samavreshena 'nunāsikyam syād iti kohālīputrā: ācārya manyate sma tivrataram ity arthah nyān n----- sarvāñ----- imān --- upa---*

The term *anu*, 'faint,' is explained by *sūkshmatatvam* (or, in G M O, *sūkshmatatvam*), 'exceedingly gentle' In other nasals than *anusvāra*, we are told, Bhāradvāja accepts Čāṭyāyana's rule, that the nasal quality is extra-strong in the nasal mutes, and simply strong in the *yamas* etc. Most of the MSS quote only *tanuvā jaya tvañ satvā* (iv 6 6¹ B has dropped out all but the beginning, *nanu*, and O has lost *tanuvā ja* from the beginning), but O adds counter-examples, *brahmanvanto devā āsan* (vi 4 10¹), *rukṣam upa dadhāt* (v 2 7²), and *tat samyatāñ samyatvam* (v 2 10⁶)

नकारस्य रेफोष्मयकारभावाद्युते च मलोपाद्यांतर-
मुत्तरं नीत्रतरमिति स्थविरः कौण्डिन्यः ॥४॥

4 Old Kāundinya says that when *n* is converted into *r*, or into a spirant, or into *y* (with loss of the *y*), or when *m* is lost, it is stronger in each case successively

The alterations of an original nasal mute are here rehearsed in the same order, and in the same terms, as in a previous rule (xv 1). The comment gives an example for each case namely *trīñ ekādāś gāñ iha* (ii 2 11³ G M have lost *ihu*, along with all that follows, to the last example, O substitutes *trīñr uta dyān*, ii 1 11⁵), *guk-lāñ ca kṛshnāñ ca* (ii 3 1³ O substitutes *rīññs tanvate*, iv 3 11³), *mahāñ indrah* (i 4 20 et al. O substitutes *svavāñ indro asme*, i 7 13⁵), and *sañgitam* (iv 1 10³ et al. O substitutes *vihar-yāñ casyam*, vii 5 5²) The first combination is styled *sanjyo-*

3 'anu sūkshmatatvam' ānunasīkyaṁ anusvāre syād iti bhāradvājo manyate yathā¹ tanuvā---- anusvāśād anyatra śāṭyāyanaviddhīh uttameshu tivrataṁ atvam yamādīshu tivrataṁ itī

¹ G M anusukshmataram ² G M om

O substitutes for the whole *bhāradvājasya* 'caryasya mat' 'anusvāre' 'nu bhavaty ānunasīkyaṁ sūkshmatatvam ity arthah ya tvañ - anusvāra itī tam ato 'nyatra śāṭyāyanaviddhīh brahm- - ruk- - tat- -

4 nakārasya repshosmayakārābhāvād¹ cakrākrshṭayakāre² lupte³ sati mūlopāde co 'ttaram uttarani⁴ ānunasīkyaṁ⁵ ānupūrvyena tivrataṁ syād⁶ itī sthavirah kāundinyo manyate yathā⁷ 'trīñr---- ity atrā⁸ 'nunasīkyaṁ samyogamūḍatīvat⁹ guk-¹⁰ ity¹¹ atra samghṣṭam¹² mahāñ---- ity atra tivrataṁ¹³ sañ-
---- ity atra tivrataṁ ity ānupūrvyaṁ vyñeayaṁ¹⁴ ato 'ny-
utra¹⁵ śāṭyāyanaviddhīh

¹ O repshābhāvād śmābhāvād yak- ² O śhte ya ³ G M ins ca ⁴ G M om (and read 'ttaram for 'ttaram uttarani in rule) ⁵ O om ⁶ O ānunasīkyaṁ bhavate ⁷ G M om, O smu ⁸ O substitutes trīñr- - rī- - sva- - ā vveṣa vih- - trīñr- - ity atra tivrata samyogamatram i- - ity atra samghṣṭam sva- - ity atra tivrataṁ vih- - atra tivrataṁ ⁹ G M om ¹⁰ W atra tu ṣṭ, B ātranuna sañṣṭ, ¹¹ W B G M atra

gamātī avat, 'simple conjunction, the second, *samgṛhīṣṭa*, 'fused together,' the third and fourth, only *tīcīratana*, 'more excessive'. And it is added at the end (only O making the statement intelligibly) that in other cases Çatyāyana's rule (xvii 1) applies

व्यञ्जनकालश्च स्वरस्यात्राधिकः ॥ ५ ॥

5 And to the vowel is added, in this case, the time of a consonant

The "and" (*ca*) in the rule is declared to continue the implication of Old Kāundinya's opinion according to this authority, here, in the prescription of *anusvāra*, the time of a consonant, half a *mora* (137), is to be added to the vowel that is accompanied by *anusvāra*, an example is *yuiyāthāñ rāsabham yuram* (iv 1 2¹ et al). And 'in this case' (*atra*, literally 'here') is added in the rule because the prescription of increased quantity is not of force in the cases detailed in the sixteenth chapter, in nasal mutes, nor where *n* or *m* is converted into *l* (v 25, 26, 28).

O states the same thing in other language, giving two additional examples, *çatrāñr anapavyayantah* (iv 6 6³) and *añhomuce* (16 12³ et al)—of which the latter, being one of those established in the sixteenth chapter (xvi 29), ought to be a counter example—and remarking further that in the opinion of other teachers the *anusvāra* merely was added to the vowel. *Anusvāra*, namely, was declared by 134 to have the quantity of a short vowel, and we should be grateful if the commentator had pointed out in what relation this rule really stands to that, it, indeed, there is any connection between them, and if this does not belong properly to a doctrine that regards the *anusvāra* as an affection of the vowel merely, causing the latter's prolongation, to be sure, but not adding an element with independent quantity to it. O appends the further restriction that the vowel undergoing prolongation is to be a simple one (not a diphthong). And it mentions another interpretation, as put forward by some authorities that *atra* signifies wherever *anusvāra* is prescribed and that where there is *anusvāra*, there the quantity of the vowel is to be short in every case.

5 *cahāra sthavarakāundinyam¹ anvādigati atrā² 'nusvārav-*
dhāne sāmudārikasvarasya vyañjanakālo hrasvārdhakālo³ 'dhikah
syād iti sthavarah kāundinyo manyate yuñj-... ityādi atrā
'va svarasye⁴ 'ti kim sādishu⁵ 'ttameshu⁶ 'ttamalabhāve⁷ cā⁸ 'tad
adhikakālavādhānam⁹ mā bhād iti

¹ W B *rah kau*, G M *nyamatam* ² W B *mabha* ³ B *nar*, G M *var*

⁴ W *adhikah*, G M *adhikah*

O substitutes for the whole *atra 'nusvare vyañjanakalo hrasvārdhakakamatrah svarasyā¹ 'dhiko bhavati svarakulat çatr -- añh-... yuñj-... caçabda sthavarahkāundinyamatānvadyati itarucaryamate 'nusvāra eva svarasva 'dhika syat atre² 'ti kim sādishu³ 'ttameshu⁴ uttamalabhāve⁵ sīmanaksharashu⁶ cū⁷ 'tad adhikakālavādhāna⁸ mā bhād teshu⁹ svarakulādhiko¹⁰ 'nusvara syat¹¹ apara ulukh atre¹² 'ityanvāsa kavādhāna¹³ ity arthah¹⁴ anusvārahāve¹⁵ 'pi vyañjanakalo¹⁶ hrasvakalo bhavati yadā¹⁷ 'nusvaras¹⁸ tādā sarvatra¹⁹ hrasvakalo²⁰ eva syat²¹*

The Rik (xiii 13) and Vājasaneyi (iv 147-8) Pratiçākhyas also concern themselves with the respective length of a vowel and of *anusvāra* as constituents of a syllable, but their rules stand in no definable relation to the one here given

स्वारविक्रमयोर्दृढप्रयत्नतरः पौष्करसादेः ॥ ६ ॥

6 Pāushkarasādi says the utterance of *svāra* and *vikrama* is attended with firmer effort

Most of the manuscripts supply in the comment *prayoga*, 'use, application,' as the subject involved in this rule, O supplies simply *vanna*, 'alphabetic sound' *Swāra*, we are told, means *svanīta*, 'circumflex,' O signifying the same thing by pointing out that the *svāras* are enumerated in the twentieth chapter (xx 1-8)

Vikrama is a particular kind of *anudātta*, 'grave,' or, O says, is explained in the nineteenth chapter (xix 1,2). As examples are given *yō 'sya svō 'gnīs tām āpi* (v 7 9¹) G M O omit the last two words) and *āsye havih priyām* (iii 3 11¹), for the latter of which O substitutes *gikyām abhy ūpa dadhāti* (v 2 4³) we have here two kinds of *svāra* or *svanīta*, namely *abhinīhata* (xx 4) and *nītyā* (xx 2), and one or more cases of *vikrama* (the grave-syllable standing directly between two that are either acute or circumflex) in each example. A counter-example is *gām vā'vā tārū tāt pāry avadātām* (i 7 2²) only O has the last two words), which contains (except in O's addition) neither *svāra* nor *vikrama*

प्रयत्नविशेषात्सर्ववर्णानामिति शैत्यायनः ॥ ७ ॥

7 Çātyāyana says, of all the letters, according to their difference of effort

The comment (except in O) supplies the same subject as in the preceding rule, namely *prayoga*, and also continues the predicate of that rule, *drdhaprayatnatarah*. The latter we can hardly approve, since to assert a specially firm effort of all alphabetic sounds without exception is little better than nonsense. Çātyāyana may rather be credited with meaning that each constituent of the alphabet has its own proper (*svocita*) degree of articulative effort—which is more true than edifying

6 *svāre vikrame ca prayogah pāushkarasāder mate' drdhaprayatnatara bhavati svārah svanīta ity arthah. vikramo nāmā 'nudāttaviçeshah yathā'* *yo.... āsye.... svāravikramayor itī kim gām.... drdhah' prayatno 'yasyā' sāv' drdhaprayatnah atīcayena drdhaprayatno drdhapi prayatnatarah*

¹ B *tam* ² G M. om ³ W B *dha*, G M *dha eva* ⁴ G M om

O substitutes for the whole *svāra viçadanuvāke gānyante ekāttavivādanuvāke vikramah svareṣu vikrameṣu ca drdhaprayatnatara vāno bhavati pāushkarasādan mate ikyam* . *yo... svāravikramayor itī kim gām* .

As example, is cited the first phrase of the Sanhitā, *ishe tvo 'nye tvā* (1 1 1 only O has the last two words)

The manuscripts of the commentary leave us quite in a quandary as to the value of these seven rules, W B calling them approved, but G M O unapproved

नातिव्यक्तं न चाव्यक्तमेवं वर्णानुद्गयेत् ।

पयःपूर्णमिवामत्रः कुरन्धीरो यथामति ॥

इत्यत्रिय अत्रियः ॥ ८ ॥

8 Ātreya says, one must utter the sounds not over distinctly and not indistinctly, taking, as it were, a vessel filled with drink, steady, according to the sense

The commentator gives only a simple paraphrase of this verse, and casts no real light upon its meaning, even as regards the naive and not very instructive comparison in the second line

CHAPTER XVIII

CONTENTS 1-7, opinions of various authorities as to the mode of utterance of the auspicious syllable *om*

7 *sarvavai nānām prayogah¹ svocitaprayatnaviśeṣhād² drdha-prayatnatara³ bhavati⁴ 'ti gātyāyano manyate yathā⁵ 'ishe.... ityādi*

'nānā⁶ 'tāni⁷ sūpta sūtrāni⁸ 'shtāni

¹ B -ga ² B syoc, W B shu, G M shat ³ W -tnah prayatnavitamo, B tnah prayatnatara ⁴ G M om ⁽¹⁾ W B etani

O substitutes for the whole *gātyāyana* ¹¹ *caryasya mate svaprayatnaviśeṣhatth sarvavarṇanam vaśeṣhyādādhaprayatnatara evam va neshu bhavati na svasvā-ravikramayor eve 'ti yathā 'ishe.... nānā 'tāni etc*

8 *atīvyaktam¹ atispashtam avyaktam aspashtam ca² yathā na bhavaty evam varṇān uddīgayed uccārayed³ 'ity arthah⁴ payah-pārnam vā⁵ 'matin kṣhīrapūritam⁶ bhāyanam⁷ 'harann va⁸ yathāmati matim⁹ anatikramya¹⁰ 'dhūo 'dhyetā¹¹ bhaved¹² ity ātreya manyate*

*iti tribhāshyaratne prātiśādhyaṁvāne
saptadaśo¹¹ 'dhyāyah*

¹ W nā 'tv ² O om ⁽³⁾ G M om ⁴ O om va ⁵ W kṣhīram apu-, B -raparipu-, O -nani pu ⁶ G M amatram ⁽⁷⁾ O paratniva ⁸ W O m ⁽⁹⁾ W O om dhro, G M adhyata yathā dhro ¹⁰ G M vel tathe ¹¹ G M O dvitayapraṇe pañcamo

आकारं तु प्रणव एके ऽर्धतृतीयमात्रं ब्रुवते ॥ १ ॥

1 As *pranava*, some utter *o* with two and a half *moras*

In the text of this rule, T reads *oṅkāram*, and B *omkāram*, in the comment, at the beginning, W B have *omkāram*. Doubtless the unnasalized form is the true reading, that *oṅ* or *om* should be uttered with more than the quantity of a long syllable would not be worth the trouble of specifying, in view of rules 134 and xvii 5, which would require either three or two and a half *moras* for the combination. Whether we are to infer that this holy exclamation was not yet uttered with a nasal ending at the time when the *Pratīkāḥya* was made, is a more doubtful question, the whole matter lies, at any rate, outside the proper province of a *Pratīkāḥya*. By way of examples, the comment appears to intend to quote the first and last words of the *Sanhitā* and of the *Brahmana* namely *om ishe tvā* (i 1 1), *samudro bandhuh om* (vii 5 25² see below B omits the *om*), *om brahma samdhattam* (*Tātt Brāh* 1 1), and *yebhyaḥ cāi 'nat prāhuh om* (B omits the *om* the Calcutta edition of the *Taittirīya-Brahmana* being incomplete, I can only presume that these are the concluding words of that treatise). The manuscripts G M O put these extracts in a different order, giving the two conclusions first, and then the two beginnings, G M add *om* at the end of each, while O gives no *om* at all. G M further append two more citations, *bhadrām karnebhuḥ • om*, and *āi 'va tapati om*, of which the former is the beginning, and the latter, I presume, the end, of the *Taittirīya-Ātanyaka*. With regard to the phrase *samudro bandhuh*, it is to be observed that the *Sanhitā* as found in my manuscript (or rather, manuscripts, for mine contains the last leaf of another and entirely independent one, which has the same reading), and in those to which Prof Weber has access, ends with *samudrah* simply, but another word like this is evidently wanting to complete the sense (the concluding sentence is *samudro vā agvasya yonih samudrah*), and is not less needed to make up the tale of words as enumerated in the ending, which counts "twelve" after *avahat*, while without *bandhuh* there are

1 *pranava*¹ *okāram*² ³*ardhatrīyamātram eke bṛuvate*³ ⁴*eka ācāryā ardhatrīyamātram*⁵ ⁶*āhur ity arthah*⁶ ⁷*ardham*⁷ *trīyam yayos te ardhatrīye ardhatrīyamātre*⁸ ⁹*yasyā 'sān*⁹ *andhatrīyamātrā*¹⁰ ¹¹*om ishe tvā samudro bandhuh om om brahma samdhattam yebhyaḥ cāi 'nat prāhuh om*¹¹ ¹²*kālanirnaye 'py evam*¹² ¹³*varnitam*

¹⁴*svādhyāyārambhageshasya*¹⁴ ¹⁵*pranavasya svarasya ca*¹⁴

¹⁶*adhyāyasyā*¹⁴ ¹⁵*nuvākasyā 'nte syād ardhatrīyatā*¹⁶

¹⁷*tugabdasya*¹⁰ ¹⁸*prayojanam ucyate samdhyaksharānām veda-pranavam*¹⁷ ¹⁹*cā 'ntarā tatthe 'ti kālanirnaye samdhyaksharānām*¹⁹ ²⁰*hrusvā na santi*¹⁸ ²¹*'ti pānīnye 'py oḥ amāti asya*²⁰ ²²*dirghakālo*²¹

only eleven This is a very strange fact, and calls for a wider examination of Taittirīya manuscripts, to see if any of them have saved the lost final word

Then is quoted a verse "from the Kalanunaya," to the effect that "the quantity of two and a half *moras* belongs to the *pranava* and to a vowel forming the beginning or end (?) of a passage that one reads in the Veda, also at the end of a chapter or section" The Kalanunīya quoted here and below must, of course, be a very different work from that of Mādhava bearing the same title (Weber's Catalogue of the Berlin Sanskrit MSS, No 1166)

In explanation of the word *tu* in the rule, another half-verse, from which I extract no suitable meaning, is quoted from the Kalanunīya, and the authority of Pāṇini is further appealed to to prove that among the diphthongs there is no short quantity hence for simple *o* long quantity is determined here, "however" (*tu*), when the diphthong stands in *pranava*, that quantity is negatived, and (quoting, apparently, another half-verse) for the *pranava*, as occurring in the Veda, is prescribed long quantity along with [the quantity of?] a *m* That is to say, the *tu* intimates a denial of the ordinary quantity of the diphthong *o* And the remark is finally added that a difference of quantity is to be recognized in the different *pranavas*

उदात्तानुदात्तस्वरितानां कस्मिंश्चिदिति शैत्यायनः ॥२॥

2 Çāṭyāyana says it is to be uttered with either one of acute, grave, or circumflex

The comment simply paraphrases the rule, adding nothing in its explanation—not even telling us in what relation it stands to rule 7, and whether Çāṭyāyana would let us give the word, in any given case of its use, whatever accent we chose, or would have us governed by reasons in our choice between the three accents

*nnāpitah²² ita tu²³ pranavasthatvarigeshenā²⁴ 'sāu kālō nishidh-
yate vedasthapranavare²⁵ tu syāt²⁶ samakuradvimātib²⁶ ate²⁶ 'ti²⁷ pri-
navarigeshe kalavipeshah²⁷ pratyeturvyah*

¹ W B *ne*, G M *vena* ² W B *onika-* ⁽³⁾ O *-triyannavate* ⁽⁴⁾ G M O
om B ins *di* ⁽⁵⁾ W *ardhatrityannatram* *bruvate* *pranave okaram* ⁽⁶⁾ B O
ardha ⁽⁷⁾ G M O *mathe* ⁽⁸⁾ G M *triyas tam*, O *triyamas tam* *sandhadvematā*
ity arthah ⁽⁹⁾ W B O om ⁽¹⁰⁾ G M *sam* --- om *ye* --- om *ish-*
om *bi ah* --- om *bhad* --- om *as* --- om O *sam* --- *ye* ---
ish --- *bi ah* --- ⁽¹¹⁾ B ins *ca* ⁽¹²⁾ B *pranavasthatvarigeshā* ⁽¹³⁾ B *adhyaya-*
ca ⁽¹⁴⁾ G M *kasya* *in ante* *to 'dhat'*, O *itye tu* ⁽¹⁵⁾ B *nu*, G M *antar*
⁽¹⁶⁾ G M *dan ca pr*, O *dan ca* *pranavum* ⁽¹⁷⁾ O *svo nu 'stā* ⁽¹⁸⁾ W om *itā*
⁽¹⁹⁾ O *ohavasya* ⁽²⁰⁾ W G M *-le* ⁽²¹⁾ G M *te* ⁽²²⁾ B om ⁽²³⁾ O *had*, G M *sha*
nad ⁽²⁴⁾ W B O *syā pr* ⁽²⁵⁾ B *kalo dv*, G M *-kule dv*, O *kare dvimatrete*
⁽²⁶⁾ G M *pranavasya* *vishah*

2 *udāttānūdaṭṭasvaritānāṃ madhye kṣmīṃś cit svare prāna-
vah prayoktavya ite çāṭyāyano brūte yathā om*

O substitutes *ute* *anudatte* *svare* *vā* *ishā* *madhyatamena* *svarena* *prayoktavya*
syād *çāṭyāyanamah ācāryo manyate* os os

धृतप्रचयः कौण्डिन्यस्य ॥ ३ ॥

3 According to Kāundinya, it is a sustained *pracaya*

I have ventured to translate the word *dhṛta* in *dhṛtupracaya* by 'sustained,' but without feeling sure that it might not have been better to follow the lead of the commentator, who treats *dhṛtapracaya* as equivalent to simple *pracaya*. He brings up, it is true, the objection that in xix 2 the use of the term *pracaya* itself is attributed to this same Kāundinya, and that hence it should have been used here, but replies "not so, by this pair of words, even, an appellation is given thus, namely on the principle that even where there is no difference of meaning there may be a difference of application, the teacher exhibits a nicety of application other examples of the principle are the names [of the second Pāṇḍava] Bhīmasena and Bhīma, [of one of Śiva's wives] Bhāmā [G M say Satya] and Satyabhāmā, *prdhāna* and *aprdhāna*, *dīpa* and *pradīpa*." The *pracaya* is defined as the fourth accent, and O adds that it is to be explained in the twenty first chapter (namely, at xxi 10,11) it is there said to be of the same tone as *udātta*, 'acute,' so that, unless *dhṛta* is to be regarded as signifying a modification, one does not see in what respect Kāundinya's opinion differs from that of Vālmīki, given in rule 6 of this chapter

मध्यमेन स वाक्प्रयोगः ॥ ४ ॥

4 That application of the voice is with middle tone

The meaning of this precept is very obscure, and the commentator's exposition does not give the impression that he comprehended it. According to him, the *sa*, 'that,' points us back to the utterance as prescribed by Kāundinya in the preceding rule in whatever pitch of voice the application is made, the *pranava* is to be used with medial effort, or with one that takes into account the

3 *kāundinyasya¹ mate pranavo dhṛtapracayo bhavati catur-
thah² svarō dhṛtapracaya itī kathyate namo pracayapārva-
ca kāundinyasya (xix 2) itivat pracaya ity etdvatī³ vā 'lam
⁴km dhṛtagabdena mār 'vum⁵ pudadvayenā⁶ pī anena nāma-
dheyam abhadrhiyate⁷ tathā hi mthubhedābhāve⁸ pr prayoga-
bhedo⁹ 'stī 'ti prayogacāturyam¹⁰ ācāryah prakatayati yathā
bhīmaseno¹¹ bhīmā¹² bhāmā¹³ satyabhāmā¹⁴ prdhānam aprdhā-
nam dīpā¹⁵ pradīpa ityādī*

¹ W -nya ² B G M tha ³ G M dhṛtagabdo nama evam ⁴ G M evā 'bh
⁵ B arādhābh-, G M vītham bhe- ⁶ B -gaprabh- ⁷ W gānturac- ⁸ W ne, B
-na ⁹ G M om ¹⁰ G M ms satya

O substitutes *dhṛtapracayo* nama turvyasvarah sa evā 'lauvīse 'nuvāke vaks-
yate *dhṛtapracaya* itī nāmadheyam prayānam apī vyapadyata itī kāundinya dā-
ryo manyate *dhṛtapracayah* pranavo bhavati yathā om itī uddīṭṭapracayo rūpya-
bhedom tat svaravyāñanukātam phalam amūṣyate

combination of high and low tone The relation of *vāh* in the compound is described as that of a locative case, and the word is paraphrased by *vācah sthāne*, 'in position (1 e, I presume, 'quality' or 'temperament,' compare xxi 11, xxiii 4,5) of voice'

स्वरितः प्रान्तिप्रान्तायणयोः ॥ ५ ॥

5 According to Plākshī and Plākshāyana, it is circumflexed

This rule is, along with its three predecessors, pronounced by the commentator unapproved

उदात्तो वाल्मीकिः ॥ ६ ॥

6 According to Vālmīki, it is acute

This is the only rule in the chapter, except the first, which the commentator allows to stand as approved In his school, then, the vowel part of the sacred exclamation is to be two and a half *moras* long, and of acute tone This agrees with the teaching of the V 17 (ii 51) and Rik (xv 3) Prātiṣākhya, save (that these give (what is really equivalent to the same thing) three *moras* to the whole word *om*, and the Rik Pr mentions other opinions both as to its quantity and its accent

यथाप्रयोगं वा सर्वेषां यथाप्रयोगं वा सर्वेषाम् ॥ ७ ॥

7 All allow that it may also be according to the application

The commentator first quotes an absurd opinion of Māhīsheya's, to the effect that *yathāprayogam*, 'according to the application,' here means *udātta*, 'acute,' but then goes on to set forth, as given by Vālmīki, what appears to be the real meaning of the rule namely, that with whatever tone the passage to be read [1 e its beginning] is used, that tone is to be given also to the introductory exclamation Thus, before *ishē tvā* (i 1 1 et al), which begins with

4 *prayujyata iti prayogaḥ madhyameno 'ccanīsasumāhāravicakṣhanena prayatnena pranavaḥ' yutra² kvacana vācu sthāne³ prayogo bhavati sa¹ iti kāundinyābhīmataḥ pūrvokto grhyate vāci prayogo vākprayogaḥ*

¹ W -va, G M -vaḥ prayoktavyaḥ ² W anya- ³ W B na ⁴ B om

O substitutes *ko 'yam pranavo nama cao*prayogaḥ [1 e *vahpr*] *kāundinyamatam ādīya yati a kvacana sthane dīyate tenu madhyamena svareṇa prayoktavyaḥ*

5 *plākshīplākshāyanayoh¹ pakṣhe² svarito bhavati nān³ tat sātracatushtayam īṣṭam*

¹ O ins *ādāryayor* ² O mate G M O add *pranava*

6 *vālmīker mate pranava udātto bhavati¹*

¹ O adds *yathā*

grave, the *om* is to be grave, before *āpa undantu* (1 2 1¹ wanting in W B), acute, before *vy'rddham* (v 1 2¹ W B have instead, evidently as a corrupt reading only, *vyādhaḥ*, with which word no *anuvāka* in the Saṁhitā begins), circumflex.

The rule is declared unapproved—rather bad treatment for one which professes to lay down a principle accepted by all authorities

CHAPTER XIX

CONTENTS 1-2, occurrence of *vikrama*, between syllables of high tone, 3-5, of *kampa*, in a circumflex followed by a circumflex

स्वरितयोर्मध्ये यत्र नीचः स्यादुदात्तयोर्वान्यतरतो
वोदात्तस्वरितयोः स विक्रमः ॥ १ ॥

1 Where a syllable of low tone occurs between two circumflex syllables, or two acute, or two of which either one is acute and the other circumflex, that is *vikrama*

The commentator paraphrases the rule as if *anyatarataḥ* meant 'between a preceding circumflex and a following acute,' and the following *udāttasvaritayoh* 'between a preceding acute and a fol-

7 *yathāprayogagabdeno*¹ 'dāto 'bhidhīyatu iti māḥiṣheyapa-
kṣhaḥ *pranave*² *yathāprayogam vā kuyād* iti sarveśhām rśhī-
nām matam *vararucpakṣhas tu vakshyate adhyeshyamānam*³
yathāprayogam yathāvidhasvaram 'tathāvidhena vā⁴ *svarena*
pranavaḥ prayoktavya iti sarveśhām matam iti *yathā*⁵ *ishe*
tve 'ty *anenā* 'dhyeshyamānenū⁶ 'nuduttena *pranavo* 'py *anudāt-*
taḥ 'āpa undantu ity *uduttano* 'dātaḥ' *vy'rddham* iti⁷ *sva-*
ratena svaritaḥ
ne 'dam *sūtram* *ishitam*

O (corrected a little) substitutes *yathāvidhena svarena* 'dhyeshyamāno bhavati
tathāvidhena svarena 'va *pranavaḥ prayoktavyaḥ* *esho* va *sarveśham ucayānam*
sādharaṇapranavavādhi bhavati *ishe tve* 'ty *etad adhyeshyamānenā udāttaḥ* *pra-*
navo vaktavyaḥ *āpa* ... ity *udāttaḥ* *vy'rddham* iti *svaritaḥ* *anuyagraha-*
nam *tesham kirtiyati* *nam* *pakṣhapaṇyāṇāṇānaḥ* *adṛṣṭaḥ* *parihāṇama* *ne* 'dam
sūtram *ishitam*

iti tribhāśhyaratne pīṭicākhyaṇivarane
aṣṭadaśo⁸ 'dhyātvaḥ

¹ W -gasac ² G M -vam ³ W adhyepaīthamanam ⁴ G M -vāha ⁵ W
B om ⁶ W. 'dhyayamānā, B -mānā ⁷ W B om ⁸ W B om ⁹ G M O
dvitīyaprajñe śaśhito

lowing circumflex' He adds examples of a *vikrama* syllable in each of the four defined positions namely *yò 'sya svo 'gnis tārā āpi* (v 7 9¹ G M O omit the last two words), *vódhavé* (16 2¹ et al.), *dhānvānā gā'h* (iv 6 6¹), and *tāsya hvā suvargó lohāh* (ii 6 5⁵ O omits the last word, G M the last two) In the third example, the circumflex by which the *vikrama* syllable is preceded is the enclitic, this shows us (what we should have inferred without it) that, as regards the application of the present precept, no distinction is made between the independent and the enclitic circumflex As an example of the use of the term, and showing the necessity of its definition here, is quoted rule xvii 6, where we are told that Paushkarasādi asserts the utterance of *svāra* ('circumflex') and *vikrama* with a firmer effort The word occurs elsewhere only at xxiii 20 and xxiv 5, where we have no assurance that it signifies the same thing as here It is found, among the other Pratiśākyas, in that to the Rīg Veda only, and has there no such meaning

The *vikrama* is marked by the usual sign of low tone, the horizontal stroke beneath The following rule, as we shall see, extends its definition so as to include nearly all the syllables so marked

• The construction of *sa* in the rule, as agreeing in gender with *vikramah*, though referring to *nīcam* (*aksharam*), was alluded to above, under v 2

प्रचयपूर्वश्च कौण्डिन्यस्य ॥ २ ॥

2 As also, according to Kāundinya, when a *pracaya* precedes

The *pracaya* (see xxi 10 11) is the series of unaccented syllables following a circumflex (enclitic or independent) in connected discourse, and uttered, save the one next preceding another following circumflex or an acute, in the tone of acute This last one of the

1 'yatra svaritayor' madhya³ udāttayor vā⁴ 'nyatarato ve² 'ti svaritodāttayor ve² 'ty arthah⁵ ' udāttasvaritayor vā⁶ madhye nīcam yad aksharam sa vikramo⁸ bhavati svaritayor⁷ madhye yathā yo¹⁰ - 'udāttayor yathā¹⁰ vódhave svaritodāttayor yathā dhānv- - udāttasvaritayor yathā tasya- - vikramasamjñāyāh prayojanam svāravikramayor drdha-prayatatnata⁹ (xvii 6) 'ti

(1) O yad āvayor (2) B G M ins sthale (3) G M ins va (4) G M om (5) G M om va (6) G M ins ita va (7) O om, G M put after madhye (8) G M masam-jñā (9) O tayor (10) O oin

2 cakāro¹ vikramam ita jñāpayati 'kāundinyasya mata udāttaparah svaritaparo vā pracayaapūrvāḥ ca vikramo vyñēyah udāttaparo yathā puri- - svaritaparo yathā upa- - pracayaḥ pūrvā yasmād² asāu pracayaapūrvāḥ³

¹ G M Q caṣabdo (2) W om (3) G M sa tatthoktah

series, which retains its grave tone, is here declared to be, on Kaundinya's authority, likewise entitled to the appellation *vikrama*. This makes the term apply to all syllables in the *samhitā* that are marked by the horizontal stroke below, excepting those which, after a pause, precede the first accented syllable. The commentator cites two examples, *pāry avadātām yā' yugīṇe divyāte* (17 2² lost in W, only O has the last two words) and *upārśhtāllakṣmā yāyā'* (11 6 2³ 4 et al), in the first of which the *pracya* is followed by an acute, in the second by a circumflex.

It is to be observed that the *vikrama* appears, so far as this treatise is concerned, to be a mere name, no peculiarity of tone is claimed to belong to it: the other treatises offer nothing analogous.

As nothing is said of the non-approval of the rule, we may regard it as accepted in the school represented by the commentator.

द्वियम एके द्वियमपरे ता अणुमात्राः ॥३॥

3 According to some, in a circumflex syllable that is followed by a circumflex, quarter *moras* are so.

I have rendered this rule according to my own persuasion of its true meaning, and not at all in conformity with the interpretation of the commentator, who says "*yama* [W alone says *diviyama*] is a synonym of *svarita*, where there are two such *yamas*, without intervention of anything, that is a *diviyama*, what is followed by such a *diviyama*, that is *diviyamapara* in the former, and also in the latter, where there is a third *yama* [so in G M, which is the best reading: the others perhaps mean *triyama*], whatever circumflexed materials there are, all those are depressed at the end to the extent of a quarter-mora: so some think. An example of a *diviyama* is *tē 'nyō 'nyāsmār* (11 2 11⁵ but B G M have instead *tē 'nyō 'nyām*, vi 1 5¹), of a *diviyamapara*, *sō 'pō 'bhy āmriyāta* (vi 1 17, 4 2³). Whence do we derive the implication 'at the end?' from the precept 'and likewise, at the end of a word are *kumapas*, quarter-moras depressed at the end'. And the implication of

3 *yamaśabdūh¹ svaritapanyāyah dvāu yamāu yatra dege nāvantaryena² vartete sa divyamah tasmin divyamah paro yasmād asū divyamaparah tasmīn ca divyame³ sati yāh⁴ svaritaprakṛtayas tāh sarvā antato 'numātrā⁵ nihatī⁶ bhavanti⁷ ty eke manyante divyano yathā te.... 'divyamaparo yathā⁸ so.... antati⁹ iti katham prāṭhyate padānte ca⁹ tathā¹⁰ kampā antata nihatānukā¹¹ iti vacanād iti brāmah nihatam¹² tu svaritayor madhye yatra nīcam (xix 1) ity¹³ etutsāmnidhyāi labhyate śikṣā cā¹⁴ vān vakshyati¹⁴*

nityo 'bhīmhatas¹⁵ cā¹⁶ vā kṣāprah praśṣhta eva ca ete svārāh¹⁶ prakampante yatro 'ccasvaritodayā¹⁷ geshasyo 'dāttatā¹⁸ vā syāt svāratā¹⁹ vā vyavasthāye

depression comes by vicinage from rule 1, above, where a syllable of low tone between two that are circumflexed is spoken of. This seems to me entirely inadmissible. In *yama* as a synonym of *svārīta*, and meaning 'circumflex,' I cannot in the least believe, and the designation of a case of three successive circumflexes as *dvīyamapara* would be excessively awkward, even without the omission of the *ca*, 'and,' which would be needed to connect it, in that signification, with *dvīyama*. On the other hand, *dvīyama*, 'of double pitch,' is an entirely natural and acceptable synonym for *svārīta*, 'circumflex,' the essential characteristic of which is that it combines the high and the low tone within the limits of the same syllable, and "a circumflex followed by a circumflex" includes every possible case. The limitation "at the end" is properly enough left to be understood from the nature of the case, but that the predicate "depressed," the most important part of the precept, should remain to be inferred by vicinage only, and from the subject, not the predicate, of the two preceding rules, is not to be tolerated. And I have no doubt that the *tāh* in the rule is the predicate, and represents *vikrama*, its gender and number being adapted to those of *anumātīrāh* by the grammatical figure *anyonyānvaya*, to which the commentator (see under ii 7, v 2) has several times appealed in other like cases. There remains, as the only difficulty, the plural number of both words: we should certainly expect rather *sā 'numātrā*, but even if we have to let this pass unexplained, it is vastly more easy to get along with than the difficulties which beset the other interpretation. One hardly dares presume to suggest that the present reading is the result of an alteration, made after the meaning given in the comment was ascribed to the rule.

The commentator goes on to quote a verse from the *Ṣikshā*, to the effect that the four kinds of independent circumflex (see xx 1, 2, 4, 5) suffer *kampa* when they precede either an acute or a circumflex. This verse is (save that it gives the Taittīyī instead of the Rik names to the accents) the same with that which is interpolated in the Rik Pī, at the end of the third chapter (iii 19). He adds further, in another half verse, doubtless from the same authority, that "of the remainder, there may either be the quality of acute or of circumflex, respectively," and explains this "respectively" as

*vyavasthāḥsubdenā 'nena²⁰ dvīvidhah kampa uktah samhitāyām
svarītakampa²¹ itaravedabhūga²² udāttakampa²³ iti ye²⁴ kampaḥ
prasiddhāḥ²⁵ teshu²⁶ etal lakṣaṇam na tu kampavīdhāyakaṁ
anyathā yo . . . ityādāu kampaḥ prasajyeta
ne 'dam sūtram iṣṭam*

¹ W *dvīy* ² W *noran-*, O *norantatory-* ³ G M *trīnyayame* ⁴ W *yam*, M *vā* ⁵ O *tra* ⁶ W *nyāta*, B *abhihūta*, G M *'bhāhita* ⁽⁷⁾ O *om* ⁸ O *anta* ⁹ O *ka* ¹⁰ W B *yātha* ¹¹ O *hi hat* ¹² G *nihat*, O *taṭvam* ¹³ B *om* ¹⁴ O *-te* ¹⁵ B *hitaḥ* ¹⁶ G M *svār* ¹⁷ W *brav-*, M *ccāccasv-*, O *ccasyasv-*, G M *-yād*, O *ye* ¹⁸ O *om* ¹⁹ B *-tor*, G M *svārīto* ²⁰ W *nī-*, O *om* *anena* ²¹ W *tah k*, B *-ta ukīah k* ²² G M *re ve* ²³ W *tah k* ²⁴ W B O *om* ²⁵ G M *om* ²⁶ B O *ins eva*

implying that there are two kinds of *kampa* in the Sanhitā, that before a circumflex, in other parts of the Veda, that before an acute, and concludes the exposition with pointing out (if I understand him) that this is a definition applying to those cases of *kampa* which are otherwise established, but that it is not a precept requiring *kampa*, since this would otherwise have to appear in such passages as *yò 'pā'm pūshpam vēda* (only G M have *vedu* the passage is not to be found in the Sanhitā, and possibly is intended to be quoted from one of those "other parts of the Veda," referred to above) Finally, he remarks that the rule is unapproved.

The term *kampa* is not found anywhere in the text of our Prātiçākhyā, or of that of the Rig-Veda, although the commentary to the latter (under iii 3,4), like our own, employs it to signify the peculiar modification undergone by the circumflex, when immediately followed by a high tone. The Atharva Prātiçākhyā (ii 65) gives to the same modification the kindred name of *vikampa*. It is signified, in the Rik and Atharvan texts (as is fully explained and illustrated in the note to Ath Pi iii 65), by appending to the vowel of the circumflex syllable a figure, either 1 or 3, and applying to the figure the signs of both circumflex and grave accentuation. The theory of this mode of designation is obscure, and no account of it is given in any Prātiçākhyā, nor, so far as I am aware, in any other Hindu authority that has yet come to light. We should imagine the figure to be a mere *point d'appui* for an added sign of grave tone, but that there appears in a part of the Vedic texts an accompanying prolongation of the *vikampa* vowel (if the vowel be short), of which the figure, therefore, appears to be the sign of this prolongation the Prātiçākhyās give no hint.

This accent wears a quite peculiar aspect in the Tāttirīya text, as compared with those to which reference has been made. In the first place, being limited to the case of a circumflex before a circumflex, it is relatively of rare occurrence, there being fewer examples of it in the whole Tāttirīya-Sanhitā than in the first book alone of the Atharvan (it occurs in the former, if I have overlooked nothing, only at ii 1 6⁵, 2 11⁵ v 4 3³ vi 1 11⁷, 5¹, 11^{2.6}, 2 21², 3 2⁵, 4², 4 2³, 9², 10¹, 6 8¹ and in the ending to v 2 1). Secondly, it is always intimated by an appended figure 1, with simply the mark of *anudātta* tone, or of *vikrama*, written beneath, while the circumflex vowel retains the mark of circumflex accent*—and this is clearly the method most easily defensible on theoretic grounds.

* That is to say, this is uniformly the case in my manuscript, which, for example, writes the commentator's quoted instances as follows

ते॒ न्या॒न्यस्मै

सो॒ षो॒ भ्य॒म्रिय॒त

and the MSS of the comment all add the figure 1, although, as everywhere else, they omit the accent signs. In the two cases that occur in the part of the Calcutta edition thus far printed, it seems to be by mere unintelligent blundering that the above method is departed from, a 3 being added in the one (ii 1 6⁵), without any sign of *vikrama* beneath it, and no designation being attempted in the other (ii 2 11⁵).

the figure represents the quantity that is added to the syllable to make room for the *vikrama* tone at the end, and it gets, therefore, the *vikrama* sign. Thirdly, in the only two passages (vi 3 4², 6 8¹) in which the vowel of the circumflexed syllable is short, it is made long.

What the commentator means by declaring the rule of no force, it is not easy to say. It can hardly be that his school acknowledged no *kampa* at all, and we should have expected him rather to interpret into his text the usage which he and his fellow-*śākhinīh* accepted as proper—as he has done in so many other cases. There appears to be no discordance between the teachings of the *Piṣṭicākhya* in this chapter and the practice in the known *Tāttiriya* text (but see the note on the next rule), the former, to be sure, do not fully explain the latter, but this is the case also with the other *Vedas*.

The denial of *kampa* in a circumflex syllable before an acute constitutes the most important and conspicuous peculiarity in the *Tāttiriya* system of accentuation as compared with that of the *Rik* and *Atharvan*, and also puts the former at a disadvantage in respect to clearness. Its effect is to deprive us of any constant means of distinguishing whether the syllable following a circumflex is an acute, or a grave with *prācaya* tone (xii 10), and whether that distinction shall be shown at all depends upon mere accident. For example, so 'smā't and sò 'smāt would be accented before a pause precisely alike, and so with any number of acutes or graves following a circumflex before a pause e.g. sò 'smād ābhavat and sò 'smā'd yó vā'rī tát*. And even if, instead of a pause, other syllables follow, there must be at least two grave syllables in succession to bring out the true condition of things—we see that the syllable after the circumflex is acute in *hy ēshā prthi-vyā'h*, but not in *hy étād devā'h*, and the *samhitā* does not tell us whether in so 'smād etarh the *asmāt* is accented or toneless†. And so often does this ambiguity arise, that in the first chapter of the third book there are not less than twenty cases of *prācayas*, all whose syllables except the last admit of being understood as true acutes‡. Other possible cases of ambiguity, of less frequency and importance, I pass without notice.

This same peculiarity belongs also to the existing *Tāttiriya*-*Brāhmaṇa* and *Āranyaka*, so that the commentator's allusion to "other parts of the Veda" as differing from the *Samhitā* in respect to *kampa* is of doubtful meaning.

* Thus, सौ ऽस्माद्भवत् । and सौ ऽस्माद्यो वै तत् ।

† Thus क्लृष पृथिव्याः and क्लृतद्देवाः and सौ ऽस्मादितर्हि

‡ Thus, सौ ऽकामयत प्रजाः may be either so 'kamayata prajā'h or

sò 'kāmāyātā prajā'h

तस्यामेव प्रकृतौ ॥ ४ ॥

4 In that very material

The commentator's interpretation of this rule is just as violent and unsatisfactory as is that which he gave of its predecessor, and with which he forces it into strange connection. He says, "in a *dvīyama* passage there is depression to the extent of a quarter-mora only in that—namely, the former—circumflex material, but, in a passage where a *dvīyama* follows, there is depression to the extent of a quarter-mora of the two former materials, but they do not all share in the quarter-mora effect—that is what the *eva* means. And Kāuhaleya says thus 'of two, the former is *anumātrika*, of three, the two former are *anumātrika*, beyond that, the natural condition holds'."

I think we can have no hesitation whatever as to rejecting this if the treatise had been intending to say what is here claimed, it would have said it in a very different manner. What is really meant, may be much more doubtful, but I imagine that we are directed to find our quarter-mora of *vikrama* in the very substance of the circumflex syllable itself, that is to say, not in any protraction of it, and so, that that treatment of the case which is signified by the insertion of a figure after the circumflex vowel is rejected. This, if established, would make the doctrine of the authorities (*etc.*, rule 3) here reported in fact discordant with the practice followed in the recorded text.

न पूर्वशास्त्रे न पूर्वशास्त्रे ॥ ५ ॥

5 Not in the former teaching

A rule of very obscure import, and respecting which the commentator has only his guesses to give us. He ventures two first, that *pārvaçāstra* signifies the rule respecting *vikrama*, and that in it this affection of the quarter-mora finds no place, second, that *pārvaçāstra* means the first rule of the chapter (which amounts, so far, to the same thing with the other), and that the name of

4 *dvīyamasthale pārvasyām 'eva tasyām' svurituprakṛtāv anumātrayā² 'pi³ nihatatvam⁴ bhavati dvīyamapure tu⁵ sthale pārvaçayor eva prakṛtyor⁶ anumātrayā⁷ nihatatvam⁸ bhavati na tu⁹ tād sarvā unukāryabhāga¹⁰ ity evakāro bodhayati evam eva kāuhaleya¹¹ āha dvayoh pārvo¹² 'numātrikas¹³ trishu¹⁴ pūrva¹⁵ anumātrikā¹⁶ uttarah¹⁷ prakṛtye 'ti*

(¹) W *apanasyām* ² B *trayo*, G M *anumatram a* ³ O om ⁴ B *-hit-* ⁵ G M *tat* ⁶ B *tyāyo* ⁷ B *numātrayor*, G M *anumātrayā* ⁸ B *-hit-* ⁹ W O *nu* ¹⁰ G M *anuk-*, O *anumatram bhagate* ¹¹ W *-leya* ¹² W *-rva*, B O *ivah* ¹³ W B O *anu*, M O *trakas* ¹⁴ W ins *ca* ¹⁵ O *pūro vā*, G M *pūro yathā uparishat* etc (end of comment to rule 2, above). ¹⁶ W *kā*, M *trakav*, O *trako 'py* ¹⁷ W *ratuh*

vikrama, there given, does not apply here in the rule for *kampa*, since, by xvii 6, *vikrama* is uttered with a single effort of the organs, while that is not the case with *kampa*. There is nothing in either of these proposals to commend it to our acceptance. If we were ourselves to guess, we should perhaps say that the reference was to rule 4 only, which teaches *kampa* without any protraction, and that this was confessed to be a doctrine not before authoritatively taught. But we should not presume to put the conjecture forward with any confidence.

CHAPTER XX

CONTENTS 1-8, names of the different kinds of circumflex independent and enclitic, 9-12, different degrees of force of their utterance

- इवणोकारयोर्यवकारभावे नैप्र उदात्तयोः ॥ १ ॥

1 When *i*, *ī*, and *u* are converted into *y* or *v*, the accent is *kshāḍipī a*, if they were acute

The conversion of *i*, *ī*, and *u* into *y* or *v* is by rule x 15, *ā* does not fall under such a rule on account of its being always *pragraha* (iv 5). Rule x 16 prescribes the conditions under which a circumflex accent is the result of such a conversion, and the addition of *udāttayoh* to the present rule is wholly unnecessary—a case to exercise the ingenuity of the commentator in defending the treatise from the charge of *pāunaruktya* but either it escapes his notice, or he declines to touch it, as beyond his powers. Of course, if it be necessary to explain here that the altered vowel is acute, it needs to be added that the following vowel is grave

5 'pārvaśāstram nāma vikramavidhāh' tasminn etad anukāramya na bhavati evam vā sūtrārthah pārvaśāstre² 'dhyāyapramasātre yā vikramasamjñā 'ktā³ 'sā kampavidhāv atī⁴ na bhavati vikramasya drdhaprayatnatvāt⁵ kampasya tadabhāvād iti⁶

iti tribhāṣhyatne prātiśākhyaavarane
ekonaviṃśo⁶ 'dhyāyah

(1) W strāṇām apī kram, B stre 'pi yo vikr, O dhva ° O rvasut্রে (2) W dhāv yatra, G M sā 'tra pracayavidhau, O sa kampavidhayakatvam (3) G M matara syat (4) G M add dvāv arthau (5) G M O dvitryaprasne saptaṁ

1 udāttayor varnokārayor yathopadeṣam¹ yavakārabhāve satīyah svarito vihitah sa kshāḍipī² iti samjñāyate³ yathā⁴ vy---- kr d h i ---- udāttayor⁴ iti kim va s ---- an v ----

1 W -adar, O -re (2) G M -ñā iduāte (3) G M om (4) W -tta

The examples are *vy èvā' nēna* (v 3 11³) and *krāhī' sv āsmā'n* (iv 7 15⁷), counter-examples, where the altered vowel was not acute, are *vāsvy āsī* (i 2 5¹ et al) and *ānu enam mātā'*, which is not, I believe, to be found in the *Sanhita*, the nearest thing to it is *ānu enam viprāh* (iv 6 8³), *ānu tvā mātā'* occurs several times (i 3 10¹ et al)

All the Prāticākhyas agree in calling this particular kind of circumflex by the name *kshāpura* (see note to Ath Pī iii 58)

सयकारवकारं वक्षरं यत्र स्वर्यते स्थिते पदे अनु-
दात्तपूर्वे ऽपूर्वे वा नित्य इत्येव ज्ञानीयात् ॥२॥

2 But where a syllable containing a *y* or *v* is circumflexed in a fixed word, being preceded by a grave syllable, or not preceded by anything, that is to be known as *nitya*

This definition of the original circumflex accent, which belongs to the word in which it occurs, and does not merely arise as a consequence of the combination of words into phrases (although ultimately of the same nature with the *kshāpura*, just described), is a long and awkward one, but fairly attains its purpose only we do not see why the reading is not *anudāttapārvam apārvam vā*, qualifying *aksharam* formally, as it does logically. A syllable that has the circumflex in *pada* text (to which *sthite pade* is explained as equivalent), otherwise than enclitically after an acute, is an original (*nitya*, 'constant, invariable') circumflex. The other Prāticākhyas (see note to Ath Pī iii 57) call it *jātīya*, 'natural'

The commentator defines *aksharam*, 'syllable,' in the rule as meaning *svaraḥ*, 'vowel,' and, in fact, the use of *aksharam* here is somewhat at variance with the general custom of the treatise, which elsewhere talks of the vowel, not the syllable, as having tone (compare i 43, xiv 29). He inserts *sarvatra*, 'everywhere,' in his paraphrase, and then explains it, as if it were a part of the rule, to signify that the accent holds in *saṃhitā*, *padā*, and *jatā* text. His examples are *vāyavyām* (i 8 7¹ et al), *kanyā' va tannā'* (iii 1 11³). O omits *tunnā'*, *tāto bīvāh* (ii 1 8²), *nyāñcam anuyāt* (v 5 3²). W B add, after a pause, as if a new example, *anyancam* [B

2 sayakāram vā savukāram vā 'ksharam' svara ity arthah
sthite pade padakāla ity arthah yatra sthite svariyate anudāt-
tapārve² 'pārve' vā pūrvābhāve⁴ 'sati' nitya eve 'te sarvatra
jāñyāt sarvatre 'te' saṃhitāpadajātāsv ity arthah yathā vāy-
---- kanye---- tato---- nyañ---- 'kva---- kvā----
iti jātyām tuṣabdo nityādāv uccodayaviśaye³ no 'dāttasva-
ritapara (xiv 31) iti nishedham nivārayati nanu⁵ nityah ka-
tham etannishedhaviśayah¹⁰ udāttāt paro 'nudātta¹¹ (xiv
29) itilakṣhaṇāsambhavāt¹² atro 'cyate varnavibhāgavēdayām¹³
udāttapārvatvam¹⁴ asti samāhārah svarita (i 40) ity ucca-

reads -*cām*], but no such word is to be found in the *Sanhitā*, and it is probably only a blundering repetition of *nyañcam*), and *kvā jāgati ca* (vii 1 4³), and, from the *jatā*-text, *kvā 'syā 'sya kvā 1 kvā 'sya* (v 7 4²). B has lost a part, it involves a case of *kāmpa*, with resulting prolongation, and use of the sign 1 see xix 3). Counter-examples are given in O only namely, of a circumflex not found in *pada*-text, *vy dvā' nena* (v 3 11³ the MS has *veryā*), *drvānah sarpāh* (iv 1 9², p *drū-annah*), of one which has an acute before it, *mātyāñ dvvā* (v 7 9¹) and *sāvāñ agnī n* (v 6 1²). We have also one of the common attempts to give a profound significance to the word *tu*, 'but,' in the rule, and, as usual, it is abortive, involving difficulties which the commentator only pretends to get rid of. He says the *tu* signifies that, so far as the *ṇitya* circumflex etc (i e and the other varieties of the independent circumflex) are concerned, the exception laid down in rule xiv 31—namely, that the circumflex character is not retained before a following acute or circumflex—has no force. But it is objected, with entire reason, that rule xiv 31 has nothing to do with the *ṇitya* at all, but only with the enclitic accent prescribed in rule xiv 29. His reply is, that in the condition of complete separation of sounds, there is, after all, a grave element preceded by an acute, as required in rule xiv 29, the combination of the two, by 1 40, giving the circumflex character. Whether this implies his recognition of the fact that the semivowel in every *ṇitya* syllable really represents an acute vowel, pronounced as such in an earlier stage of the language—*kvā* being equivalent to *kūa*, and *kanyā* to *kanā*—admits of question. He expounds *anudāttapūve* as a descriptive instead of a possessive compound, and *apūve* as a substantive of the same character, as if the construction were 'there being a preceding grave, or there being no preceding accent,' it is doubtless better to supply in idea *tasmin akshare*, and to render 'when that syllable is' etc. The remaining bit of exposition is much corrupted in its readings, and the drift of it is not clear to me. O brings it in very differently from the rest, and makes it involve an additional example, *yāyā' 'īā' nani* (ii 3 5³, p *yāyā ā evā enam*).

pūrvatūt¹⁵ svaritasye 'ti nishedhaviṣhayatvam anudāttas ca
'sāu pūvaś ca 'nūdāttapūvaś¹⁰ tasmin¹ pūvābhāro 'pūvaś
tasmin¹⁷ 'gānye tu sarvatrapūrvatūt¹⁸ pūvatvaviṣeshanadvā-
yasy¹⁹ 'nyathā²⁰ vānyarthya¹ tasmāt tatra²² ṇityasvaritatvam²³
eva nu¹⁴ samjñānturam iti vijñeyam

¹ W B om, G M add *yatra svariyate* ² O ins *va* ³ B om ⁴ G M ins *va*
⁵ G om ⁶ O pr ⁷ W B ins *anyāncam* ⁸ G M O *-darhavi*, O *shayo* ⁹ G
M *na tu* ¹⁰ O *nish* ¹¹ G M ins *svartum* ¹² O *laksh* ¹³ all MSS have the
lingual l ¹⁴ W *-rvam* ¹⁵ W B *ucyate pu* ¹⁶ W ins *tasmāt* ⁽¹⁷⁾ G M om
⁽¹⁸⁾ O *na gunya ity arthah sthite pada iti kim vy-- dī v -- anudāttapūva*
iti kim mari--- *sar---* *kicid evam ucuh yaj-- ity adī prathamniṣa-*
karoty evakārūh pūvasamudāye anudāttapūvatvat, G M *gunyapūvasasarpūvatvat*,
W *sarvatrat*, B *dhūnye* etc ¹⁹ W *pūrvavireśhādū*, B *pūrvatvaviṣeshanā*,
O *nūrvam* ²⁰ O *rtatū* ²¹ W *thūam*. G M *thūam svat* ²² W *am*. B *tat*.

अपि चेन्नानापदस्थमुदात्तमथ चेत्साङ्हितेन स्वर्यते स प्रातिहृतः ॥ ३ ॥

3 If, moreover, there is an acute standing in another word, then, if there be a circumflex resulting from a rule of combination, it is *prātihata*

The phraseology of this rule is very peculiar indeed, and its peculiarity hard to account for. The Rik and Atharva Prāṭicākhyas distinguish only two kinds of enclitic circumflex the *pādu-vṛtta*, in which a hiatus intervenes between the acute and its successor, and the *tānovyāyana*, in which the two are separated by consonants. According to the explanation, now, of our commentator, the present treatise sets off from the latter, as a separate class, a circumflexed syllable at the beginning of a word, following an acute at the end of the preceding word. He gives us four examples (of which, however, W B omit the first two, and O the last two) *mā te asyā'm* (16 12⁵), *yās tvā hrā'dā' kīrīnā* (14 46¹ only O has *kīrīnā*), *isl'é tvā* (11 1 et al), and *tām te dṛugādshāh* (11 2 10²) the second word in each has the *prātihata* circumflex. As counter-examples, we have *yān nyānām* (v 5 3² W gives instead *yān nāvām* [11 3 10¹ et al], but it does not illustrate the point arrived at, and so is doubtless a corruption of the other), to show that the following circumflex must be a result of a rule of combination, and *tāyā devātuyā* (iv 2 9² et al O substitutes *tusmād vaupam*, which is corrupt, I have overlooked it in searching out the references, and do not know how, if it in fact represents a real citation, it ought to be amended), to show that the acute must stand in another word.

In working out this meaning for the rule, the commentator declares *api*, 'moreover,' to have the office merely of bringing down from the preceding rule the quality of going before (*pār-vatva*), *atha*, 'then,' according to him, either cuts off the continued implication of *nitya* (that is to say, means nothing at all), or else gives the value of a heading to "the being preceded by an acute standing in another word"—which is wholly to be rejected, in the first place because unnecessary (*tusmāt* in the next rule having just that purpose), and in the second place because the word could at any rate make a heading only of what followed it in the rule, not of what went before.

3 *apigabdhā' pārvatnamātrākharshukah² athagabdo nityasam-jādvayavachedakah nānāpadasthodāttapārvatvādhrīkārako³ vā nānāpadastham aksharum udāttapārvam¹ cet parato nicam sāmhitena vādhīnā svaryate cet sa prātihato 'tri⁴ i editavyah 'yathā mā.... yas....⁵ 'ishe.... tam....⁶ sāmhitene 'tri kim⁷ 'yan..... nānāpadastham itī kim. tayā....'*

(¹) W *purva* simply (²) G M om *tvā-*, O om *-ātr-* (³) O *kāro* (⁴) G M om (⁵) W B om, G M om *yathā* (⁶) O om (⁷) O *tasmādvayupam*.

If this be indeed the original intent of the rule, it would seem that, to the apprehension of the Hindu phonetists, there was difference enough between the enclitic circumflex which *te* in *tām te* assumes in *samhitā*, having been grave in *pada*-text, and that which the *śākh* of *duṣcākskhā* has in *samhitā* as well as in *pada*, to furnish ground for a difference of classification and nomenclature*. But there are various obstacles in the way of our accepting the interpretation as satisfactory. In the first place, why ought not the same distinction to apply where the acute and circumflex are separated by a hiatus, as well as by consonants? or why, when a circumflex after an acute in the same word is called *tārovyāṅgana*, alike whether a hiatus or consonants intervene, should a circumflex after an acute in another word have a different name according as it is preceded by a consonant or not? In the second place, why should the rule be thrust in here, wholly out of connection with the others respecting the enclitic circumflex, and with such a frightful sacrifice of that economy of expression which the *sūtrahara* proverbially rates so highly? for, following rule 7, a simple *nānāpadasthāt tu prātihatah* would have done the whole business, and much more unequivocally. Not one of the other treatises mixes together thus the enclitic and independent *svaritas*, when they come to be defined and named. Nor, again, does any other authority found a separate species of accent upon the basis here laid down. I have been inclined, therefore, to conjecture that the rule ought to be rendered 'when there is besides (*api*) a [preceding] acute in another word, then, provided a circumflex arises as the result of a rule of combination, it is *prātihata*' understanding an independent *svarita* (except a *nitya*) to be intended, whenever that *svarita* was preceded by an acute, and so held a position which would make it an enclitic *svarita* as well, and the reason for thus calling attention to it being that, as written, it is not distinguished from a mere enclitic accent†. But there are too many difficulties connected with this interpretation also to allow of its being accepted as at all satisfactory.

The *Vajasaneyi-Prātiśākhya* (i 118) gives a special name, *tāro-virāma*, to the enclitic circumflex which falls in the *pada*-text upon the first syllable of the second member of a compound, under

* And this difference, it should be noted, applies in the same manner where division is made between the two parts of a compound word, for the extant Taittiriya *pada* text, in marked contrast with those of the other Vedās, regards the *avagraha* pause as suspending, like the *avusana*, all accentual influence, and writes *rūdrā vah*, for example, in the same fashion as it writes *rukram astu*—that is to say,

शुक्रञ्वती । instead of शुक्रञ्वती, as the rest would read

† For example, *ghṛtā'r vy udyate* (iii 114) and *anācuna'h svashṭm* (iii 92) are written precisely as if they were *ghṛtā'r vy udyate* and *anācuna'h svashṭm*, namely,

घृतेर्व्यद्यते and आनशानाः स्विष्टिम् this is an ambiguity which

is common to all the Vedic texts

the influence of an acute on the final of the first member, and which is therefore 'separated by an intervening pause' from the tone which calls it forth. Thus, the *va* of *gukrā-vatī* (as written the second time in the first marginal note on p. 369) has १ *tārovrāma svarita*, being marked by the ordinary *svarita*-sign. Now the *vatī*, as well as the *gukra*, in this word, is to the apprehension of the present treatise (148) a *pada*, and hence its syllable *va* appears to fulfil all the conditions laid down in rule 2, just above, as determining a *jātya*. It is circumflexed in the *pada*-text, it is *upārva*, or preceded by no other accent in the same *pada*, and it is *savakāra*, or contains a *v*. Here, now, as it appears to me, we have the best explanation of the value, and at the same time of the position, and also, at least in part, of the phraseology, of the rule under discussion. This accent needs definition, though enclitic, immediately after the *nitya*, lest it be confounded with the latter. "even if all the conditions of the previous rule are fulfilled, if there is likewise an acute [preceding the syllable] in another word, and the accent is one which is produced by a rule of combination, this accent is not *nitya*, but *prāthata*."

The most conspicuous difficulty in the way of accepting this interpretation is the fact, already referred to, that in the extant *pada*-text of the Tāttirīya-Saṁhita there is no such circumflex as is here assumed, the *va* of *gukrā-vatī*, and all other syllables in like position, being grave, and marked as such. But the difficulty is more apparent than real, since we have no right to assume that this *pada*-text is precisely the same with that held by the school from which the Prāṭiśākhya, or this particular rule, emanated: they may have accented their *vīgyas*, or separable words, after the same fashion which prevails in the *pada*-texts of the other Vedas. Of more account is the awkwardness of the whole expression, and especially the use of *nānāpadastham* instead of *avagrahasam*, which would be the proper term to use in this treatise (compare 149) in the sense here indicated. But, if not completely acceptable, the interpretation has more for it and less against it, in my opinion, than either of those given above.

Professor Roth, in his early digest of the teachings of the Prāṭiśākhya respecting accent (introduction to the Nirukta, p. lvi etc.), identified the *prāthata* accent with the *tārovrāma*, but only in consequence of a misunderstanding of the character of the latter, which he supposed (ibid., p. lxx) to designate an enclitic circumflex separated by consonants from its occasioning acute in a preceding word, thus giving it the same meaning which is attributed by our commentator to the *prāthata* in the present rule. And Weber (under Vaj. P. 1118), while defining the *tārovrāma* correctly, repeats the same identification, I do not know whether as taking it incautiously from Roth, or as having arrived by conjecture at an independent interpretation of our present rule. He does not allude to any difficulties as connected with the latter, nor state his identification to rest upon a different basis from that of Roth.

तस्मादकारलोपे अभिनिहता ॥ ४ ॥

4 After such a one, in case of the loss of an *a*, it is *abhinihata*

The word *tasmāt* the comment explains as bringing down *nānā-padaṣṭham udāttam* from the preceding rule 'after an acute occurring in another word' But the specification (like that of *udāttayoh* in rule 1) is wholly unnecessary rule xii 9 prescribes the circumflex and defines its conditions here we need only to have given us the name by which it is to be called

O has an independent exposition, but of equivalent meaning

The examples are *sō 'bravīt* (ii 1 2¹ et al) and *tē 'bīvan* (ii 5 1³ et al), and a counter-example, where, as the eliding diphthong is not acute, no circumflex results, is *bhrā'jo 'sī devā'nām* (ii 4 3²)

All the other treatises (see note to Ath Pr iii 55) give to this circumflex the name *abhinihata*, of which our own term has the aspect of being an artificial variation

उभावे प्रक्षिष्टः ॥ ५ ॥

5 Where an *ū* results, it is *prākṣhita*

Rule x 17 prescribes the circumflex to which the name of *prākṣhita* is here assigned, and the examples given are to be found there also, being all the instances save one which the Sanhita affords They read in this place *sū'nniyam vva* (vi 2 4¹), *sū'dgātā* (vii 1 8¹), *māsū 'ttishtan* (vii 5 2² G M omit *mā*), and *dikshū 'padādhātī* (v 5 5⁴ G M O omit)

The same name (or, in the Ath Pr, *prākṣhita*) is given by the other treatises to the circumflex which results from the fusion of two short *ū*'s, the first acute and the other circumflex (see note to Ath Pr iii 56)

पदविवृत्यां पादवृत्तः ॥ ६ ॥

6 Where there is a hiatus between two words, it is *pādavṛtta*

Here there is abrupt change, without notice, from the independent to the enclitic circumflex The examples given are *tā' asmāt srśhtā'h* (ii 1 2¹ B omits *srśhtā'h*), *sā vdhā'nāh* (iv 4 4⁵), and *yā*

4 'tasmān nānāpadaṣṭhōdāttāt parabhūtānūdāttākārasya² lope satī yāh svaritah so 'bhinihato veditavyah¹ yathā so---- te ---- tasmād iti kim bhrā'jo----

(1) O substitutes *tasmāt sū'nniyam na svariyamanādāhe te sadakale asvarita ity aritah akāralupte ya svara ādityat so bhinihato nama svarito bhavati* ² W B -dāttasya, G M *parabhūtād anūdāttasya* 'kai asya

5 ūbhāve yatra svaryate sa prākṣhito veditavyah sūn-----
sūd----- māsū----- 'dikshū-----¹

(1) G M O om .

upasādah (vi 2 4¹), while, as counter-example, to show that the hiatus must be between two *padas*, not two parts of the same *pada*, we have *prāugam ukthām* (iv 4 2¹ this implies, of course, that the *pada*-text does not treat the word as a separable one)

The Rik Pī (iii 9,10) calls this accent *vāvrtta*, and there is nothing in its definition or in that of the Vāj Prāt (i 119) which should limit the accent to the case of a hiatus between two *padas*, or deprive the *u* of such a word as *prāuga* of its right to rank as a *pādavrtta*. See the note to the next rule

उदात्तपूर्वस्तीरोव्यञ्जनः ॥ ७ ॥

7 Where an acute precedes, it is *tārovyañjana*

The form of this rule, again, is almost unaccountably peculiar. The term *tārovyañjana* means 'with consonant-intervention,' and all the other treatises (see note to Ath Pī iii 62) define the accent in accordance with this, as being one in which the circumflex is separated by intervening consonants from the occasioning acute. Here, to be sure, such a definition would hardly answer, as there is a single word in the *Sanhita*, *prāugam*, in which a vowel is regarded as having *tārovyañjana*, although there is no consonant between it and the acute. But why specify *udāttapārva*, 'preceded by an acute,' in this rule, when it was just as necessary in rule 6? The commentator says that, as the implication has been made all along, its repetition here is for the purpose of signifying that the acute is now to be understood to be in the same word with the circumflex. That may satisfy him, but is not calculated to content us. If *nānāpadaṣṭham udāttam* was implied in rule 6 from above, then *pādavivrttyām* should have been simply *vivrttyām*. Things would be made much better by putting rule 6 after rule 7 then we should be able to give *udāttapārva* in rule 7 a meaning, as recalling to mind the actual cause of these two accents, and rule 6 would stand as an exception to the other and more general statement, pointing out a class of cases in which, though depending on a preceding acute, another name was applied to the accent.

The commentator's examples are *yūñjānty asya* (vii 4 20), *vāsavy*

6 *padayor vivrttiḥ padavivrttiḥ¹ tasyām yah svarayate sa pādavrtto veditavyah² yathā³ tā... sa... ya... vivrttir vyaktir⁴ ity arthah padayor iti haṁ prā-----*

¹ W B O om ² B *bhanati* ³ in O only ⁴ B *vyāptatirikta*

7 *udāttapārvaḍḍhikāre sūti punar atra tatkāthanād¹ ekapada-sthōdāttavirgesho² 'vagamyate³ tasmād ekapada-sthōdāttapārvo yah svaritah sa⁴ tārovyañjano veditavyah yathā⁵ yūñj----- vas----- sa----- tad----- prā----- tam. ...*

¹ G M *kaṭh*, O *tu k* ² G M *-sīhavya*, O *-sīhavya-* ³ O *gam-* ⁴ O *asau* ⁵ in O only

asi (12 5² et al.), *sā indro* 'manyata' (vii 1 5⁵ G M omit *sa*), *tād āgvo* 'bhavat' (v 3 12¹), *prāṅgam* (iv 4 2¹), and *tām tvāśtā* "'dhat-tu' (15 1³ G M omit the last word) It is very odd—but, I presume, merely accidental—that in every one of these cases (except *prāṅgam*) the vowel which finally shows the circumflex is not of the same word with the acute, but belongs to another word which has been combined with its predecessor, and, after the combination, gets the circumflex by the general rules xiv 29,30 (for the commentator has expressly denied under rule x 12 that the initial grave *a* of *asya*, for example, receives the circumflex in virtue of its combination with the enclitic circumflex *ti* of *yujānti*). I do not see why, in the first two cases, at any rate, the circumflex is not *prā-tihata*, according to the commentator's explanation of the meaning of that term, and should even incline to conjecture that these are the examples selected and current for the present rule before the erroneous interpretation of rule 3 was established.

No one of the other *Pratigākhyas* limits *tārovyāṅgana* to an enclitic circumflex following its acute in the same word (see note to Ath Pr iii 62), it is quite an oversight, therefore, that the St Petersburg lexicon gives the term only this restricted meaning—(perpetuating Roth's original error, referred to above, in the note to rule 3)

इति स्वारनामधेयानि ॥ ८ ॥

8 These are the names of the circumflex accents

The commentator simply gives examples for each accent, in part new, in part the same with those furnished under the rules defining each—namely, for the *kshāpra* (omitted in G M), *abhy āsthāt* (iv 2 8¹) and *ādhvanyō voh* (vi 4 3⁴—this is a blunder, there being no *kshāpra* in the phrase, B O read instead *adhvanyūh* [vi 2 9⁴ et al.], which does not mend the matter), for the *nitya*, *vāyavyām* (i 8 7¹ et al.) and *kvā 'sya* (v 7 4² G M have *kvā* simply), for the *prātihata*, *sā te lokāh* (v 7 26 G M omit *lokāh*) and *yāt tvā kṛuddhāh* (15 4² G M omit *kṛuddhāh*), for the *abhinihata*, *sō 'bravīt* (ii 1 2¹ et al.), for the *praghshta*, *sādgātā* (vii 1 8¹), for the *pādavṛtta*, *tā enam* (ii 3 11⁴ W reads, blunderingly, *tām namām* [ii 6 11¹], and B substitutes *sā vdhānāh*, iv 4 4⁵), and for the *tārovyāṅgana*, *māma nāma* (15 10¹)

नैप्रनित्ययोर्द्वैतरः ॥ ९ ॥

8 *ity etāni sūpta svaritanāmadheyāny¹ ākhyātāni² yathā*
³abhy---- *adhv-----* *iti kshāprah³* *vāy-----* *kvā-----* *iti*
nityah *sa-----* *yāt-----* *iti prātihatah* *so-----* *ity abhīnihatah*
sādg----- *iti praghshtah* *tā-----* *iti pādavṛttah* *māma-----* *iti*
tārovyāṅganah

¹ W māny, B ydms svaritanādm ² O vydkh ³ G M om .

9 In the *kshāpṛa* and *natya*, the effort is firmer

The commentator makes very short work of the remaining rules of the chapter, and we can afford to do the same, as they teach us nothing of value

अभिनिहते च ॥ १० ॥

10 As also in the *abhinihata*

The commentator says that *ca* in this rule is used in the sense of secondary adjunction (*anvācaye*), and so signifies that the effort of utterance in the *abhinihata* is *drdha*, 'firm,' merely—a less degree than the *drdhatarā*, 'firmer,' or 'quite firm,' of the preceding rule. The same may be also inferred, he adds, from the fact that the *abhinihata* is made the subject of a separate rule, instead of being included in rule 9, with the other two

प्रस्निष्टप्रातिहृतयोर्मृदुतरः ॥ ११ ॥

11 In the *prachishṭa* and *prātihata*, it is gentler

Nothing is to be inferred from its association here as to the real character of the *prātihata*. This rule and its successor were referred to under 146, but for no intelligibly useful purpose

तैरोव्यञ्जनपादवृत्तयोरल्पतरौ ऽल्पतरः ॥ १२ ॥

12 In the *tairovyañjana* and *pādavṛtta*, it is feeble

9 *kshāpṛe natye ca prayatno¹ drdhatarāḥ kāryaḥ²*

¹ W *tna*, B *-tna*, O *yatno* ² W B om

10 *anvācaye vartamānaḥ cakāro drdhamātram bodhayati¹ abhinihate² ca³ prayatno⁴ drdhaḥ⁵ syāt na tu drdhatarāḥ iti prthaksūtrārambhād api⁶ pratiyate*

¹ B *hite* (as also in the rule) ² O om ³ G M insert *mrdutarāḥ*, and rule 12 ⁴ O *dhataram* ⁵ W *abhi*, B om

11 *prachishṭe prātihate ca prayatno mrdutarāḥ kāryaḥ*

12 *tairovyañjane pādavṛtte¹ ca prayatno² 'lpatarāḥ syāt³ 'yady apy⁴ alpamrduḍṛdhabhāvau⁵ tatro⁶ 'ktas tathā⁷ 'j⁸ dīpavād venupatnivad⁹ iti śikṣānuṣṭhāt¹⁰ komalāśvashatvāt¹¹ sarvati a vyñeyam¹²*

iti tribhāshyaratne prātiśākhyavarane
vinco¹³ 'dhyaḍyaḥ.

(¹) O *cā 'lpatarām karanam bhavati* (²) W om (³) G M O om (⁴) G M ins *tatra* (⁵) M 'pi 'ti (⁶) B *kshithānuṣṭhānāu* (⁷) B *ālpāśik*, G M *kāvalyaśvāstava* (⁸) O *jñeyam* (⁹) *yathā yuvā kavī* (¹⁰) G M, O *dvitvayapraṇa* (¹¹) *aśtamo*

Alpatara, 'feeble', is doubtless meant to signify a still less degree of force of utterance than *nirdutana*, 'gentle'.

To the commentator, his *Çikshā* appears to be a higher authority than the *Prātigākhyā*, at least in this part, and he adds that, although the qualifications 'feeble, gentle, firm' are here attributed to the accents in question, yet, in accordance with what the *Çikshā* says, "like a candle, like a rush-leaf" (? unintelligible without the context), it is to be understood that there is softheadedness (?) in them all alike. And O adds an example, *yūvā kavīh* (13 14¹)

CHAPTER XXI

CONTENTS 1-9, division of consonants in syllabication, 10-11 *pracña* accent, 12-13, *yamas* or nasal counterparts, 14, *nisikya*, 15-16, *svanabhakti*

व्यञ्जनं स्वराङ्गम् ॥१॥

1 The consonant is adjunct of a vowel

This brief principle calls forth a long discussion. Reference is first made (except in G M) to rule xxiv 5, as, by its requirement of a comprehension of *aṅgu*, 'adjunct' (literally 'limb, member'), creating a necessity for the present precept (and for those that are to follow). Objection is then at once taken to the principle if, in such cases as *kūpa* and *yūpa* (and G M add yet other words as illustrations), it is the consonant that indicates the difference of meaning, ought not the vowel, rather, to be considered as adjunct

1¹ *vyāñjanam svarāṅgam bhavati svāso nādo 'ṅgam eva ca* (xxiv 5) *iti vijñeyatvena*² *vidhānād ayaṁ dṛambhah nanu*³ *kūpo yūpa*⁴ *ityādau vyāñjanam eva 'rthaviśeṣabodhakam*⁵ *iti svarō vyāñjanāṅgam kim na*⁶ *syāt ucyate vyāñjanam kevalam avasthātum na śaknoti kim tu sāpekṣam*⁷ *svaras tu nirapekṣah*⁸ *sāpekṣanirapekṣahayor nirapekṣam eva viśiṣṭam ācakṣate prekṣāvantah viśiṣṭapratyañgatvam*⁹ *aviśiṣṭasyāi*¹⁰ *'va kim ca svaravāṇiṣṭyubodhakam anyad api vidyate*¹¹

*durbalasya yathā vāśṭam kurate*¹² *balavān nrpaḥ*

*durbalam vyāñjanam tadvad dhātū ate*¹³ *balavānt svarah*¹⁴

¹⁵ *kim ca çikshāvyañhhyāne*

yah svayam vādyate tam tu svaram āha patañjaliḥ

*uparisthāyina tena vyāṅgam vyāñjanam ucyate*¹⁶

*svarās tu*¹⁷ *brāhmaṇa jñeyā ityādi*

*udāttag cā 'nudāttag ca*¹⁸ *svarītag ca svarās trayah*¹⁹

²⁰ *hrasvo dīrghah pluta iti*²¹ *kālato*²² *nīyamā*²³ *ucyate*²⁴

²⁵ *ti*

of the consonant? The answer given is, that a consonant is incapable of standing alone, and so is dependent, while a vowel is independent, and that, as between a dependent and an independent, the enlightened regard the independent as superior, and it belongs to the inferior to be adjunct to the superior. Moreover, there is found also another proof of the superiority of the vowel, in the verse "as a mighty monarch takes possession of the realm of a weak one, so the mighty vowel takes possession of the weak consonant." The beginning of another verse is added "the vowels are to be known as belonging to *brahman*." But between this part of a verse and the whole verse that precedes, G M insert another, which is asserted to come from "the exposition of the *Çikshā*," and which gives a highly imaginative derivation for *svara*, 'vowel,' and *vyañjana*, 'consonant.' "Patanjali styled that a vowel which *shines* by itself [*sva-ra* from *sva-yam* *rājate*] the consonant is so called as being imperfect [*vyañjana* from *vyañga*, literally 'limbless'] without [² the expression needs mending, to bring out a desuabie sense] the other following it." Then all start together upon a new argument for the superiority of the vowel with yet another verse, which is actually found in the known *pāṇinīya Çikshā* (verse 23, see Weber's *Indische Studien*, iv 353) "acute, grave, and circumflex, the three accents, and short, long, and protracted, these, in regard to quantity, are the necessary characteristics of the vowels," which shows that acute tone and so on are attributes of vowels only, and of consonants in virtue of their being adjuncts of vowels

svarānām evo 'dattādayo dharmāḥ ⁴ *vyuñjanānām* ¹⁶ *tu* ¹⁰ *tadān-*
gatayā ²⁷ *vyuñjanam ardhamātrām* ²⁸ *svaraḥ ca mātrākālah.*
tayoh samdhiḥ ²⁹ *adhyardhamātrah* ¹⁰ *ity evam dughakālah pra-*
saktah tatpratishedhārtham vyuñjanam svaryāgam ity uktam
svarasamsrṣtusya ³¹ *vyuñjanasya svarakāla eva kālo drutivrttāu* ³²
na tu ³³ *svaryayā* ³⁴ *'na* ³⁵ *sarvatre* ³⁶ *'ty arthah* ³⁷ *drutivrttāv iti*
kim ³⁸ *hrasvārddhakālam vyuñjanam* (137) *iti* ³⁹ *vyartham*
syād iti brāmah yathā ⁴⁰ *kshirodakasamparke* ⁴¹ *lshīrasayā* ⁴² *'vo*
'palabdhir no 'dakusya tathā svaravyuñjanasamparke ⁴³ *svaryayā* ⁴⁴
'vo 'palabdhir ⁴⁵ *vāḥśishtyam* ⁴⁶

¹ O ins *svarasya* 'ngam *svaram* ⁽²⁾ G M *svara* ⁽³⁾ G M *na* ⁽⁴⁾ G M *-pas*
supah kalah valah balah phala ⁽⁵⁾ O *-sha* *iti do-* ⁽⁶⁾ O om ⁽⁷⁾ W B *-kshā* O
saksheyaḥ ⁽⁸⁾ O *-kshah* ⁽⁹⁾ G M *'htam svanam prat-* ⁽¹⁰⁾ O *shtam prat-* ⁽¹¹⁾ G M
M *-sya vyuñjanasya* ⁽¹²⁾ G M *asṭi* ⁽¹³⁾ G M *harita* ⁽¹⁴⁾ G M *-ra* *iti* ⁽¹⁵⁾ m
G M only ⁽¹⁶⁾ G M *ca* ⁽¹⁷⁾ B om ⁽¹⁸⁾ G M *put before svaryā* ⁽¹⁹⁾ G M O
hrasvārdghaphlūtāḥ car ⁽²⁰⁾ *'va* ⁽²¹⁾ G M *lako* ⁽²²⁾ G M *-yatu* O *-yatīs* ⁽²³⁾ W
grayi, G M *apri*, O *tate* ⁽²⁴⁾ G M ins *vacanāt* ⁽²⁵⁾ G M ins *na tu* ⁽²⁶⁾ O *-janam*
⁽²⁷⁾ W *tu dam*, G M om ⁽²⁸⁾ O *tadharmaṭayā* ⁽²⁹⁾ G M *-trākam* ⁽³⁰⁾ O *sam*
⁽³¹⁾ B G M O *ardham*, G *trika*, M *traka* ⁽³²⁾ W *rasamashṭi* ⁽³³⁾ W *dut*, B
dut, O *dr̥gatatu* ⁽³⁴⁾ W *svārūh sparśasyā* ⁽³⁵⁾ *'va*, O om ⁽³⁶⁾ B *vasye* ⁽³⁷⁾ B om,
W *dut*, O *dr̥tav* ⁽³⁸⁾ G M om ⁽³⁹⁾ G M om ⁽⁴⁰⁾ G M *rkāḥ*, O *kshīrā* ⁽⁴¹⁾ *dudake-*
sampa ⁽⁴²⁾ G M *rkāḥ* ⁽⁴³⁾ W *sparśasyā* ⁽⁴⁴⁾ W O *bāhir*, B *bāhār* ⁽⁴⁵⁾ B
vapishṭayā, G M *shyam*

Next we pass to the consideration of another reason why the principle stated in the rule needed to be laid down. The consonant (by 1 37) has half a *mora* of quantity, and a vowel has [for example] a *mora* then combination, then, would seem to have a *mora* and a half, and so would be liable to be understood as of long quantity. This untoward conclusion is avoided by the present rule, which implies that in fluent utterance the quantity of the vowel belongs in all cases to the combination of consonant and vowel, and not to the vowel alone. The specification "in fluent utterance" (literally, 'in running action') is made in order to save the significance of rule 1 37.

Finally, the superiority of the vowel is once more inferred from the fact that, when it is combined with a consonant, it alone is perceptible, just as, when milk and water are mingled, the milk alone is perceived, and not the water.

तत्परस्वरम् ॥ २ ॥

2. And it belongs to the following vowel

The commentator explains *parasvaram* as a descriptive compound (*harmadhāraya*), governed by *bhāyate* understood, such an ellipsis, however, is so violent as to be hardly admissible, and the word is perhaps better taken as a possessive (*bahuvrīhi*), somewhat anomalously used. The occasion of the rule, we are told, is the doubt which is liable to arise as to when the consonant—which, owing to its having the vowel as a superior, is unable to stand by itself—is an adjunct of the preceding, and when of the following vowel. A single phrase is quoted as example, namely *mān eva lohān upadhāya* (v 5 5³ O omits the last word).

This is the leading and introductory principle in all the Pratiśākhyaś (see note to Ath P 1 155), it is greatly restricted in its application by the following rules

अवसितं पूर्वस्य ॥ ३ ॥

3. A consonant in *pausa* belongs to the preceding vowel

The commentator explains *avastitam* as meaning 'standing at the end of a *pausa*,' and gives as examples *ārka* [1 2 2² et al. W has instead *rka* [iv 7 9¹ et al.], and O has *vāk* [1 3 9¹ et al.], *vashat*

2 *svarapradhānatvā* kevalam avasthatum asahamānam¹
²vyāñjanam kadā pūrvasyā 'ṅgam² 'kadā pūrvasyā 'ṅgam³ iti
*samdehe*⁴ vyavasthāpuyati tad aṅgabhātam⁵ vyāñjanam para-
*svaram bhāyate yathā*⁶ mān---- paraś cā 'śhu svaraś ca
*parasvarah*⁷ tam⁸ svaraparam⁹

¹ O om ⁽²⁾ G M om ⁽³⁾ W O om, G M kaducūl apar ⁽⁴⁾ G M hum
⁵ W anābh-, O eṣasūtratan ⁽⁶⁾ B, om ⁽⁷⁾ W ins param svam ⁽⁸⁾ O om ⁽⁹⁾ G
 M O om

(ii 2 12⁴ et al), *tat* (*passim* given by G M only), and *havih* (i 2 4¹ et al)

This principle, of course, is without exception in its application. It is either stated or implied in the rules of the other treatises (see note to Ath Pī 1 57)

संयोगादि ॥ ४ ॥

4 Also the first consonant of a group

That is to say, as the commentator points out, of a group consisting of either two consonants or more than two. The "also" (*ca*) expressed in the next rule is declared to be implied here also, and to prescribe adjunction to the preceding vowel. The examples given are *yajñān vyādigaṭ* (vi 6 11¹) and *apsv antah* (i 4 5² et al) but G M substitute *apsv agne* [iv 2 11³], and W has the corrupt reading *agvatali*. If, now, we had only to take the groups of consonants as they stand in the ordinary text, and divide them, the application of this and of the remaining rules for syllabication would be simple enough, but we are required to apply also the rules for duplication etc. as found in chapter xiv, and to make the insertions required by the rules of the fifth (v 32, 33) and the present chapter (12-16), which puts quite a different face upon the matter. In fact, in the examples furnished, *nt* is the only group which is divided *n-t* without farther ceremony, *gr* becomes and is divided *g-gr*, *ny*, in like manner, *n ny*, *psv* is expanded into *p-phsv*, and *ñ* into *g-ñ* (writing the *yama*, as I have done elsewhere, with a straight line above the letter), where, by the action of the next rule, two consonants go to the preceding vowel. The class of groups consisting of two consonants only, and such consonants as (by xiv 23) are not liable to duplication, is the only one of which the division is settled by the present rule alone. It contains (in the Tāttvīya-Saṁhitā) thirty-nine groups, such as *nt*, *tñh*, *pp*, *yy*, *ny*, *ḥḥ*.

The other treatises hold this same principle, and teach it in an equivalent manner (see Ath Pī 1 56 and note)—save that the Rik Pī (i 5, xviii 18) allows the letter to be adjoined to either the preceding or the following syllable

3 *avasitam padāntavanti*¹ *vyāñjanam* ²*pūrvasya svarasyā*
'ṣgam' ³*syāt yathā*⁴ *ārka nashat tat*⁵ *havih*⁶

¹ G M *antarv* ⁽¹⁾ G M *pūrvasvarāḥyam* ⁽²⁾ B om ⁴ () om ⁵ W () om

4 *'dvayor bahūnam*¹ *vā samyogo bhavati*² *tasya samyoga-*
*syā*³ *'dā*⁴ *vyāñjanam*⁵ *pūrvasvarasyā*⁶ *'ṣgam*⁷ *bhavati*⁸ *'yathā*⁹
yajñān---- *apsv*---- *parasūtre cakārah*¹⁰ *'pūrvasvarāṅga-*
*tvābodhaka*¹¹ *ity atī*¹² *'pī tu*¹³ *labhyate*¹⁴

⁽¹⁾ B om ² G M om ³ W *varnānam*, ⁽⁴⁾ M *samyogānam* ⁴ G M ms *yad*
⁵ G M ms *yad* ⁶ G M ms *tat* ⁷ W *pūrvasya*, ⁽⁸⁾ O om ⁹ G M
om ⁽¹⁰⁾ W O om ¹¹ G M *svarasya* *'ng-*, B *-ngam* *bo-* ¹² G M om

The manuscripts of the commentary are more than usually defective in this neighborhood. B has lost the present rule, with something of what precedes and follows it, O omits the next rule, with passages before and after, W has done the same, to a somewhat less extent, but rule 5 and the lacking part of its comment were apparently restored on the margin of W's original, and its copyist has put them in in the wrong place, next before rule 6.

परिण चासङ्कितम् ॥ ५ ॥

5 And one that is not combined with the following vowel

The comment supplies the word *svarena*, 'vowel,' as that with which *parena* here agrees, and the whole interpretation is constructed accordingly. The meaning is, then, that (with the exceptions to be further specified in the following rules) only the final member of a group of consonants is to be adjoined to the following vowel, the rest belonging to that which precedes. By way of illustration is given merely *tat sarvutuh* (15 6⁴ et al.) a most insufficient and ill-chosen example, since, in the final form of the group *ts*, only one consonant goes with the preceding syllable thus, *t-tts*. But the commentator is obliged to spend his strength, and vainly, in endeavouring to refute an obvious objection to the rule itself, which he thus states "well, but then the foregoing rule is meaningless, since by this one also the quality of adjunction to the preceding vowel is assured to the consonant that begins a group." And he replies, "you must not think that for, in such cases as *maryaśrīh* (iv 1 2⁵ et al.) and *ai vā 'śi* (17 8¹ et al.), in which the *y* and *v* are doubled after *r* by rule xiv 4, the former *y* or *v* is by the present rule made an adjunct of the preceding vowel, but the *r*, by rule 7 below, would become an adjunct of the following vowel and that is impossible, since no such pronunciation ever takes place. So, as one or the other must needs be annulled, the question arises which is to be annulled, and here rule 4 comes in to settle the question."

This is not a very acceptable exposition, although it in a manner involves the true relations. Rule 4 is not meant as a safeguard against the misapplication of following precepts, but is a fundamental principle, with reference to which the present rule stands in a subordinate position, and the two must be understood as if they read "the first member of a group belongs to the preceding vowel, and, along with it, such other members as are not immediately combined with the following vowel." The former principle obtains everywhere, without exception, to the latter, rules 7-9

5 'parena' svarena¹ 'samhitam'² asamyuktam³ 'ryaṅjanam'⁴ pā-
nasvarāṅgam bhavati⁵ yathā⁶ tat---- nana tarhi pūrvasā-
tram anarthakam sunnyogādibhāṭasyā⁷ 'pi vyūṅjanasyā⁸ 'nenā⁹
'va pūrvasvarāṅgatvasiddheh māi¹⁰ 'nam mansthāh¹¹ marya-
śrīh ai vā 'śi ity atra yavakārayo rephāt param ca (xiv

establish very important and extensive classes of exceptions. If the mode of statement adopted in the treatise is open to some objection, we cannot help it, the slight inaccuracy is perhaps a consequence of the general prevalence of the doctrine of rule 4, to which its successor is added as an extension peculiar to this school.

No one of the other Prāticākhyas recognizes any such principle as this: those of the Rik (15, xviii 18) and Atharvan (158) add to the initial consonant of a group only the first of a following pair which is the result of duplication, that of the White Yajus including further (1104, 105) the other one of the pair, provided a mute follows. Its sway is, as already remarked, much more limited than would be thought at first sight, because rule 7 establishes a different usage for the immense class of groups of which a semi-vowel stands as final member, and rule 9 for the much smaller but yet important class in which a spirant stands last, or followed by a semi-vowel. Its general effect is to attach to the following vowel only such consonants or groups as could begin a word, leaving the rest to belong to the foregoing syllable. There seems to be need of illustrating, more fully than the commentator has deigned to do, the sphere of its application.

This is, in consonant-groups originally of two members, to

1 Groups in which a mute is doubled (or its corresponding non-aspirate prefixed to it, as will be understood hereafter without special remark) after a sibilant (γ or φ, xiv 9, 15), / (xv 2, 3), or / (xiv 4, 15), the first member of the group remaining unchanged; thus, *χk-k*, *lk-k*, *rk-k*. These are twenty-seven in number, and to them may be added *γγ-γ*, *φφ-φ*, *λλ-l*, *νν-v*, which, by the final specification of rule 7, follow the same mode of division. In regard to these, the usage as fixed by our treatise is the same with that sanctioned by the rest, as already mentioned.

2 Groups in which a mute, or *v*, is doubled before a mute of another series; thus, *kk-c*, *vv-n*. Of these there are fifty-one in the *Sanhitā*.

3 The same, but with the addition (by xxi 12) of *yama* before the final member; thus, *gg-ḡn*. Twenty-three groups.

4 Groups in which the initial spirant (sibilant) is doubled, and also the following mute (by xiv 9), only the last of all going to the following syllable; thus, *cc-c*. Thirteen groups.

5 The same, but with *yama*; thus, *ccp-pm* (*cm*). Six groups.

6 Groups in which *h* is doubled before a nasal, with *udāhṛtya* (by xxi 14; but see the note to that rule, for a different interpretation) thus, *hh-n*. Three groups only.

Against these one hundred and twenty-six groups, growing out

4) *iti dvitve* ⁹ *krte prathamayavakārayoh parena cā 'sañh-*
*tam*¹⁰ *ity anena pūrvasvan āṅgatvam*¹¹ *prāptam*¹². *rephasya tu*¹³ *ñ ā*
'ntasthāparam asavarṇam (xxi.7) *ity anena paravivaraṅga-*
*tvam*¹⁴ *prāptam*¹⁵ *tac cā 'gakyam tathocādṛuṇāsamābhavāt*
*anyatarabādhe*¹⁶ *kartavye sati kṛm vā bādhyam*¹⁷ *iti samdehah*¹⁸

of original simple pairs, there are eighty like *l-ky* (from *ly*) and *k-khsh* (from *ksh*), in which, by rules 7 and 9, only the initial consonant of the finally resulting group goes with the preceding vowel.

When, now, the pairs here rehearsed come to be extended to triplets by the addition of a third member, if that member be a semivowel, or a spirant (sibilant) following a mute, the point of division remains just where it was before. And so also, of course, in the like extension of the groups mentioned under rule 4, above, as undergoing no change in the *varṇakrama*. Thus, *gg* (*g-g*) is divided like *gg* (*g-g*), *gy* (*gy-gy*) like *gy* (*gy-gy*), *śś* (*śś-śś*) like *śś* (*śś-śś*), *śś* (*śś-śś*) like *śś* (*śś-śś*), and *śś* (*śś-śś*) like *śś* (*śś-śś*). And the very great majority (one hundred and fifty-four) of the groups of three consonants occurring in the *Sanhitā* have a semivowel as their final member, with final sibilant there are only seven.

If, on the other hand, double groups are extended to triplets by appending a mute, either non-nasal or nasal (which happens in thirty-one cases), the point of division is, by the operation of the present rule, shifted toward the end of the group. Thus, we have

- 1 *śś*, but *śś-t*, two groups, and *śś-ś*, but *śś-ś-ś*, two groups,
- 2 *śś-ś*, but *śś-ś-ś*, five groups, and *śś-ś*, but *śś-ś-ś*, five groups,
- 3 *śś-ś*, but *śś-ś-ś*, two groups,
- 4 *śś-ś*, but *śś-ś-ś*, two groups,

which are extensions of the groups of two members already treated of, and advance the division only one point. But further, groups ending in a sibilant, and falling under rule 9, below, and those which by rule 15 have *svarabhakti*, exhibit, when a mute is added, a still greater transference forward of the point of division, and we have

- 5 *k-khsh* (*ksh*), but *k-khsh-t* (*kst*), four groups, and *k-khsh* (*ksh*), but *k-khsh-ś* (*kshś*), five groups, and, finally,
- 6 *śś-ś* (*śś*), but *śś-ś-ś* (*śśś*), and *śś-ś*, but *śś-ś-ś* (*śśś*), three groups.

In the yet further extension to groups of four members, the same principles prevail. There are found nineteen such groups in which the additional letter, being a semivowel, has no effect upon the division, and only three in which the division is altered by an added mute. These last are *śś-khsh-t* (*śśkshn*), from *śś-khsh*, *k-khsh-t* (*kshn*), from *k-khsh* (*ksh*), and *n-khsh-t* (*nksh*), from *n-khsh* (*nksh*).

Finally, the only two groups of five consonants occurring in the

Sanhitā (*ntstr* and *tstry*) are formed by added semivowels, and so do not come under the further action of the present rule

G M read *asāñhitam* instead of *asāñhitam* in the rule

अनुस्वारः स्वरभक्तिश्च ॥ ६ ॥

6 Also *anusvāra* and *svaabhakti*

By G M, this rule is divided into two, *anusvārah* and *svaabhaktiṣ ca* (while, on the other hand, T reads *anusvārasvaabhaktiṣ ca*), and such a division is noted, if not accepted, in the comment, by all the manuscripts, which say "of this rule (*svaabhaktiṣ ca*) is made a setting-apart, although the prescription is identical (with that made in the other rule, *anusvārah*)" And the object of thus separating what is confessed properly to belong together is stated to be "to bring about the adjunction of *svaabhakti*, in some cases, to the following vowel," on the authority of a verse which is quoted, to the effect that "the knowing man in a verse connect with its predecessor (?) the *bhakti* that follows a short vowel, and in *rtasya dhārshadam* the *bhakti* is said to do as it pleases," but G M substitute for the latter half of the verse "to it should be assigned one *moīa*, also before a pause and in cases of hiatus" The whole matter is exceedingly obscure, or quite unintelligible, without aid from the context of the quoted verse. The words cited as examples are not found in the Sanhita, but they occur in the Rig-Veda (at 1 143 7), and also in the Taittirīya-Brahmana (1 2 11²), where the *svaabhakti* has assumed the form of a full vowel, and the word reads *dhārushadam*. It looks as if the commentators had set out to divide into two rules what they nevertheless have to acknowledge to be really only one, for the purpose of interpreting into the latter half of it, when set by itself, a license to the element in question to be treated either way, but, as they have not fully carried out their intention, I have preferred to retain the unity of the rule. It is quoted, we may further remark, under rule 134, in all the manuscripts of the comment, apparently without any thought of a division

6 cakārah samuccayakathanādvāra¹ pārvāsvārāṅgatvākarṣha-
kah² 'anusvārah³ pārvāsvaram⁴ bhagate⁵ yathā⁶ aṅṣ -
svaabhaktiṣ ca pārvāsvaram⁷ bhagate yathā⁸ qārḥ- - -
vidhāu⁹ samāne¹⁰ sūtrasyā¹¹ 'sya prthakkaranam¹² kracit svā-
bhakte¹³ purāṅgatvam¹⁴ āpādayitum¹⁵ tathā hi

¹⁶svarād dhruvāt¹⁷ parām bhaktim pracayitvam nayed¹⁸ budhah

¹⁹rtasya dhārshadam ce²⁰ti svutanti ā bhaktir ucyate²¹

¹ B -ra, (G M -thanā nā, O -dvāt) ⁽²⁾ G M put after *anusvārah*, as its comment, giving all the rest as comment to *svaabhaktiṣ ca* as a separate rule ⁽³⁾ O om ⁽⁴⁾ W G M O *svarāgam* ⁽⁵⁾ G M *syāt* ⁽⁶⁾ (G M O om) ⁽⁷⁾ O *sva-* ⁽⁸⁾ G M O om ⁽⁹⁾ O *samā-* ⁽¹⁰⁾ O -na, G M add *anusvāra* *svaabhaktiṣ* ⁽¹¹⁾ ce²¹ ⁽¹²⁾ B -kār ⁽¹³⁾ O *prthagnaktārah* ⁽¹⁴⁾ W B G M *padā* ⁽¹⁵⁾ W B *ditum* ⁽¹⁶⁾ B *svarāga hr-* ⁽¹⁷⁾ G M *na ced* ⁽¹⁸⁾ G M substitute *tasyā mātṛā bhaved ekā virene ca vṛttitva*, O adds ⁽¹⁹⁾ from comment to next rule

Anusvāra appears here once more with the distinct value of a consonantal element following the vowel—and yet not as a full consonant, else it would fall under rule 4 above, and would require no separate treatment. The treatise is not so explicit as were to be in defining what is to be done with it in syllabication, but I presume we may infer that it does not count as *saṃyogādi* at all, but only as if an affection of the preceding vowel, and hence, that all the groups which it introduces are to be divided as if it were not there, that *ñcc*, for example, is to be made into *ñycc-c*, *ñsm* into *ñssp-ṣm*, and *ñstr* into *ñsst tr*. The example given by the commentator is *añṣunā te* (12 6), but it is an ill-chosen one, and quite worthless, as, in any view of the nature and treatment of *anusvāra*, no question could arise as to the division *añ-ṣunā*.

For *svarabhakti*, see the concluding rules of this chapter (xxi 15,16). The example given is *gāḥapatyah* (16 7¹ et al), which we are to read and divide *gāḥ-ha-pat-tyah*.

नातस्यापरमसवर्णम् ॥ ७ ॥

7 But not a consonant that is followed by a semivowel, if dissimilar with it

The negative here signifies a direct reversal of the implication, as it denotes a denial of adjunction to the preceding vowel, and hence necessarily involves adjunction to the one that follows, since the consonant cannot stand by itself. "Dissimilar" is simply explained by *vilakṣhana*, 'of diverse characteristics, different,' it excludes from the operation of the rule the doubled semivowel itself, and would also exclude the nasal semivowel into which *n* and *m* are converted before *l*, and *m* before *y* and *v* (v 26,28), if these occurred where the rule could apply, which is not the case.

The examples quoted by the commentator are *adhyavasāya dīṣah* (vi 15¹, 1 e *ad-dhya-*), *madhumayrena* (v 28⁶ et al, 1 e *niṣ-pre-*), *aḥlonayā* (vi 16⁷, 1 e *aḥ-glo-*), and *iṣhe tvā* (i 11 et al, 1 e *i-ṣhet-tvā*) they are not to be commended as at all fully illustrating the wide range of application of the rule. This has been sufficiently set forth above, under rule 5. It helps to determine the division of one-third of the groups of two consonants, of four-fifths of those of three, of six-sevenths of those of four, and of all those of five—or of four-sevenths of the whole number of consonant

7 *nakāḥaḥ pūrvasvarāṅgatvavyāvartakāḥ antasthāparam
vyañjanam tasyā antasthāyā asavarnam vilakṣhanam pūrvasva-
rāṅgam na bhavati arthāt parasvarāṅgam 'tad iti vedatavyam'
'svatu sthātum aḥakya tvāt' yathā¹ adhy-.... madh-....
aḥl-.... iṣhe-.... antasthā purā yasmāt tad antasthāparam.
asavarnam iti kim par-...*

(¹) G M *iti vyñeyam*, O om (²) O puts at end of comment on preceding rule,
B *svaram vna sthā* O om

groups. By way of further examples, we may cite the two groups of five, they are *vi-yu yātthst tryas sya* (ii 6 5⁴) and *ab bra-van̄thst-ti i-kā-mā* (vi 1 6⁵).

But if the commentator's direct illustration of the rule is scanty, his counter-illustration is yet less satisfactory. To establish the necessity of the specification *asavarnam*, 'dissimilar,' he cites only *paravādyam anvita* (v 4 11³). Such cases as this, however, are rather covered by the fundamental rule *samyogadh* (xxi 4), and the application of the present one is to the groups in which a semi-vowel is doubled after *r*, and which we are to read *iy-y*, *el-l*, *iv-v*, while, on the other hand, in the half-dozen groups in which two different semi-vowels follow a mute, both of them, along with the preceding mute, go to the succeeding vowel: thus, *nish-shvāñ-ñvyāre-chat* (ii 3 2⁶), *a-vit-trya-va-tu* (i 8 22¹), and *gr-hāñ-dvī-ñ* (ii 3 1⁸).

नासिक्याः ॥ ८ ॥

8 Noi the nose sounds

The "nose-sounds" are here again (as under ii 49) defined as the *yamas* (xxi 12, 13) only, but there is no reason why we should not regard the *nāsikya* (xxi 14) as likewise included (see the note on rule 14). The examples given are also of *yamas* only: *rukman upa dadhata* (v 2 7¹ et al. O has *rukman* only) and *rājne sūkarah* (v 5 11. O substitutes *svardhñe*, v 6 21). The groups, in their full form, are read and divided *kā-km* and *jy-jñ*. An example of the *nāsikya* would be *nāh-ñi-ta-mam* (i 1 4¹).

The Vāj. Pī. (i 103) reckons the *yama* to the preceding vowel, neither of the other treatises says anything about it.

स्पर्शश्चोष्मपर उष्मा चेत्यरश्च ॥ ९ ॥

9 Noi a mute that is followed by a spirant: provided the following spirant is likewise in the same case.

The first *eu* (translated 'or' here), the commentator says, effects the connection of the rule with its predecessor; the second (rendered 'likewise') implies adjunction to the following vowel. This is not very lucid, for the two things are really equivalent to one another. And in the further exposition, the *parah* appears (the readings are not consistent or clear) to be taken as signifying *parasvarāṅgam*, but this cannot well be correct. The phraseology of the rule, indeed, is very peculiar, and I do not see how it is to be accounted for unless we may conjecture that the proviso *āshma cet paraç eu* is a later addition, made after it had been noticed that the more general statement *sparsuç eo* "shmaparah

8 *nāsikya*¹ *yamāñi*² *parasvaram*³ *bhagante*. *yathā*⁴. *rukman*
..... *rājñe*

¹ B om ² G* M *yah* ³ W *svanaparam* ⁴ G M O om

included too much. The meaning is clear that a spirant which itself belongs to the following syllable, as being either directly combined with the vowel of the latter (xxi 5) or followed only by a semivowel before that vowel (xxi 7), carries with it a preceding mute, but if, on the other hand, it be cut off from the succeeding vowel by a mute, so as itself to belong to the antecedent syllable, a mute before it goes, of course, to the same syllable. The examples given in the comment are this time well selected, and illustrate the three cases involved: they are *shatt sam padyante* (v 4 3⁴ et al) and *vashatt svāhā* (vii 3 12), in both of them a *t* is inserted, by rule v 33, between the *t* and *s*, and the final reading and division is *tt-ths* and *tt-thsv*. As counter-example we have *akṣhṇayā vyāghāyati* (v 2 7⁵ et al), where, after all rules are satisfied, we have *kkhsht-in*.

As compared with those to which rule 7 applies, the consonant groups falling under this rule are few, only forty-six in all, in thirty of which the spirant carries the mute before it to the following vowel, while in the remaining sixteen both go together to the one that precedes. The detail is as follows.

Of double groups, composed of a single mute and spirant, there are seven: for example, *k-khs* (*ksh*)

Of groups containing three consonants, the largest class is that formed by the addition of a semivowel to the preceding: for example, *k-khsy* (*kshy*) it contains ten groups. Then there are two like *ṛ-khs* (*ṛksh*), three like *tt-khs* (*tksh*), and the isolated *rk-khs* (*rks*).

Of groups of four consonants there are seven on this side, all but one (*rtt-ths* = *rtt*) like those of three, but with an added semivowel, which does not (xxi 7) change the division.

On the other side, where the spirant goes back to the vowel of the antecedent syllable, there are, of course, no groups of two consonants. Of groups of three we have nine, four with following non-nasal mute (as *kkhs-t* = *kst*), and five with following nasal (as *kkhs-ti* = *kshn*). Of groups of four, there are two (as *tt-hst-ti* = *tstr*) formed from the foregoing with added semivowel, and three from triplets ending in a sibilant increased by a mute, either non-nasal (namely *nt-hst-t* = *ntst*) or nasal (as *ṛkhsht-in* = *ṛkshn*). The two groups of five consonants, which also belong here, have been given above, under rule 7.

This finishes the subject of the division of consonant-groups in syllabication, the special elaborateness and intricacy of whose treat-

9 *pārvaḥ cakuro nāśihyā* (xxi 8) *ity anena samuccayavācukāḥ uttaras tu¹ paravavarāṅgatvākarshakāḥ āśhnapara sparṇas ca paravavarāṅgam bhavati asāv² āśhmā³ paraḥ cet⁴ paravavarāṅgam⁵ ced ity arthah shat --- vashat----* *āśhnaparaḥ ced iti kim aksh----- āśhmā paro yasmād asāv āśhnaparaḥ*

¹ G M cakuro 'pi ² B asā ³ MSS -mu ⁴ W cen na, O cen sha ⁵ W B, -gaḥ, O ga

ment in this Prāticākhya has rendered necessary a fuller illustration than was thought worth while in connection with the others, in order to render apprehensible the views held regarding it by the authors of the treatise

स्वरितात्संज्ञितायामनुदात्तानां प्रचय उदात्तश्रुतिः ॥१०॥

10 Of grave syllables following a circumflex in *samhitā* there is *pracaya*, having the tone of acute

The theory of the *pracaya* accent has been so fully set forth in the note to Ath Pr in 65 that I do not need to spend many words upon it here. Its effect is, as there pointed out, to give to all the syllables which are left in the written text without any accent-mark the same high tone, whether they be *udatta*, 'acute,' or *anudatta*, 'grave'. Thus, in the example given by the commentator, *āgne dūdha gahya kṇṣṇa vanya yā' te* (v 5 9¹ G M omit *yā'* te), which is written in *pada*-text

अग्ने । दुध्र । गक्ष्य । किंशिल । वन्य । या । ते ।,

the *samhitā*-reading is

अग्ने दुध्र गक्ष्य किंशिल वन्य या ते,

the grave syllables *dūdha gahya kṇṣṇa van-* being without written designation of accent, like the two acute syllables *āg-* and *yā'*, and being by this rule uttered upon the same pitch with them. It makes no difference whether the circumflex which precedes the *pracaya* is enclitic (as in the illustration given) or independent, and I have pointed out above (under xiv 3) that, owing to the absence of *kampa* in the Tāttirīya-Samhitā where a circumflex precedes an acute, there are very numerous cases in the text where the *samhitā* alone does not show us whether the unmarked syllables following a circumflex are *udatta* or *pracaya*—whether, for example,

क्षैतद्वाः, सौ ऽस्मादेतद्दि, and सौ ऽकामयत प्रजाः,

are to be read *hy etād denā'h* or *hy etād devā'h*, so *'smā'd etārhu* or so *'smād etārhu*, so *'kā'māyātā prayā'h* or so *'kāmayata prayā'h*.

In the note referred to, I ventured the conjecture that the mode

10 *svaratāt pareshām anudattānām anudattayor anudattasya vā samhitāyām* ¹ *pracayo nama dharmo² bhavati yathā agne*
---- *anudattānām itī kim agnaye*---- *samhitāyām itī*
kīm agne---- *udattasya grutir va grutir yasya³ 'śāv⁴ udatta-*
grutir itī⁵ pracayasvarūpanam āpanam⁶ ato na punaruktaśāhā⁷.

¹ B ms. ca ² G M dheyo ³ G M sa for asāu ⁴ W om ⁵ B svarūpanam
⁶ W -ktāśāhā ⁷

of writing the accent might not have been without influence on the theory as to its character—that is to say, that the Vedic phonetists may have come by an afterthought to declare the *prācaya* syllables of acute tone, and to pronounce them so, *because* they agreed with the acute in being without a sign of accent, while originally no such correspondence in character was perceived or intended to be signified. The conjecture will doubtless have appeared to many somewhat wild, but I think that in studying the development of the Hindu theory respecting accent it at any rate deserves to be taken fully into account and carefully considered. I am far from regarding it at present as anything more than a conjecture, yet one or two matters have come to light since it was put forth which at least add to its plausibility. Haug, namely, in a valuable and interesting communication from India to the Journal of the German Oriental Society (vol. xvii, 1863, p. 799 ff.), shows that the modern Hindu reciters of the Veda give tonic distinction only to the syllables that have the accent-signs, the *svarita* and *anudatta*, so that the *udatta* appears to be no accent at all, and is entirely confounded with the toneless *prācaya*—thus, under the influence of the mode of written designation, turning topsy-turvy, as it were, the whole system of spoken accent. And again, the peculiar system of writing the accent practised in the *Çatupatha-Brahmana* (which uses only one sign, the horizontal stroke beneath the syllable, applied in all the other known systems to mark the *anudatta* tone), has been turned in later times into a peculiar system of accenting, and treatises have been written to explain and teach it as such (see Kielhorn and Weber, in Weber's *Indische Studien*, v. 397 ff. *).

The commentator points out that two grave syllables, or even one, following the circumflex, receive the character of *prācaya* (of course, with the restriction made in the next rule), and not more than two only, as is literally signified by the plural *anudattānām* in the rule. To show that the conversion into *prācaya* is limited to grave syllables, he quotes *agnāye prāvate* (ii. 4. 1² et al.), to show that the conversion is made only in *samhitā*, he gives part of the other passage in *pada*-form, namely *agne dūdhiḥ qahya kiñçilā vanya* (Ō adds *yā*). We might naturally infer from this that the *prācaya* accent does not occur at all in *pada*-text, but the inference is not a necessary one (since the rule only says that syllables which are *anudatta* in their *pada*-form become *prācaya* in *samhitā*, without implying that there may not be *prācayas* in *pada*-text which remain such in *samhitā*), and would doubtless be erroneous, for at least the extant *pada*-text of the *Taittiriya-Samhitā* agrees in this respect with those of the other Vedas, and writes *gīrvanase*, *antārikṣham*, and *samāguchanta*, for example,

* It ought to be added, that Haug and Kielhorn do not look at the matter in the same light in which I have placed it, but incline to believe in the reality and antiquity of what I have called the modern and artificially substituted systems: this is no place to discuss the subject, but I feel confident that the view I have taken will prove the only one tenable.

गिर्वणसे । अंतरिक्षं । and सुमगङ्तेति संजगङ्ते ।
not गिर्वणसे । अंतरिक्षं ।----संजगङ्ते

The peculiarity of this *pada*-text in treating the *avagāha* as a full *avasāna* in regard to the designation of accent (as shown in the third of the examples), has been already spoken of above (under rule xx 3)

The terms of the rule would justify us in understanding *pracaya* to have its etymological meaning of 'accumulation, continued series,' and translating 'a series of grave syllables following a circumflex in *samhitā* is of acute tone,' and perhaps this was actually the intent of the rule-makers, but I have preferred, as the safer course, to follow the authority of the commentator in translating. To him, indeed, the term is so distinctly a technical one, implying utterance with acute tone, that he thinks it necessary to explain that *udāttagruhi* is added by way of definition of the peculiar character of the *pracaya*, and therefore is not open to the reproach of *punarukti*, or superfluous repetition

नोदात्तस्वरितपरः ॥ ११ ॥

11 But not when an acute or circumflex follows

That is to say, when such a series or *pracaya* of grave syllables is followed by an acute or a circumflex syllable, the one next preceding the latter is not made to be of acute tone, but retains its proper grave character, and is marked with the *anudatta* sign. The commentator offers as examples *tāyā devāḥ sūtām* (iv 1 2¹ W B omit *sūtām*, without which the passage is found elsewhere, G M substitute *tāyā devātayā*, iv 2 9² et al) and *tād ahuḥ kvā jagati* (vii 1 4³ G M omit *jagati*). These illustrations are wanting in variety, inasmuch as they show between the two independent accents only two original grave syllables, whereof one becomes an enclitic circumflex and the other remains grave, we may take the first example under the preceding rule as showing how an actual *pracaya* ends with a grave before the following original accent

The subject to be supplied with the predicate in this rule is *svarah*, of course. There is an objectionable ambiguity in the form of the rule, inasmuch as there might most naturally seem to be *anuvṛtti* of *pracayah*, and so a denial of that accent anywhere excepting before a pause

We have seen at xix 2 that the name *vikrama* is given to the

11 *udāttaparah¹ svarituparo vā 'nudāttah pracayo na bhavati yathā² tāyā.... tād..... udāttag ca³ svaritag co 'dāttasvaritau tād paṇḍu yasmāt sa tatho 'ktaḥ*

¹ O ro vā ² G M O om ³ B om

grave following a *pracaya*, as well as to one that comes immediately after a circumflex

स्पर्शादनुत्तमादुत्तमपरादानुपूर्व्यान्नासिक्याः ॥ १२ ॥

12 After a non nasal mute, when it is followed by a nasal, are inserted, in their order, nose sounds

Which nose-sounds, as we are told in the next rule, some call *yamas*, and by this familiar name, which the other *Prātīkhyas* apply to them directly, we shall here, as we have done elsewhere, know them. The treatise teaches us nothing more about them, except (ii 49-51) that their place of production is either the nose or the mouth and nose, and that the producing organ is as in the series of mutes, and farther (xli 8), that in syllabication they are to be reckoned with the following vowel

The theory of these curious and equivocal constituents of the ancient Hindu alphabet I have discussed pretty fully in the note to Ath Pi 199, and I have no new light to throw upon the subject here. They are transition-sounds, assumed to intervene between non-nasal and following nasal, as a kind of nasal counterpart to the non-nasal, and therefore called its *yama* or 'twin'

The meaning of *ānupārvyāt*, 'in their order,' is ambiguous, as it might be understood to refer to the order either of the twenty non-nasal mutes or of the five nasals, or, of the four kinds of non-nasal mutes in each series—in which last sense the comment understands it, declaring that the first *yama* follows a first mute, the second a second, and so on, and he has before (under i 1) reckoned the *yamas* as four in the catalogue of alphabetic sounds. I have pointed out under ii 51 how difficult it is to reconcile this view with that of a variation of their organ of production as in the five series of mutes

The commentator's examples are *tam pratnathā* (i 4 9), *vimath-nānāh* (iii 5 4³), *vidmā te agne* (iv 2 2¹ O omits *agne*), and *dārūni cladhmasi* (iv 1 10¹)—one, namely, for each of the four classes of mutes. As rule xiv 24 expressly enjoins duplication of the non-pasal mute in these combinations, we are to read and divide *prattinathā*, *vidd-āma*, and so on. The counter-examples (of which all but the last are lost in W) are as follows to show that the insertion is made only after a mute, *kalmāshi bhavati* (v 1 1⁴ O substitutes *brahmuṣādīmah*, i 7 1⁴ et al), that this mute must be a

12 *uttamaparād anuttumāt sparṣād* ¹ *ānupārvyād yuthākramam nāsikyā āgumā bhuvanti prathamaspārṣāt prathamānā-skyah* ² *dvitīyād* ³ *dvitīyah* ⁴ *evam* ⁵ *anyatrā* ⁶ *pi* ⁷ *yathā* ⁸ *tam*
---- *vim*---- *vidmā*---- *dār*---- *ityādi* *sparṣād iti*
kim ⁹ *kalm*---- *anuttamād iti kim* *sumn*--- *uttamapa-*
rād iti kim ¹⁰ *śabdah*----

¹ G M ins *parata*, O ins *parah* ² G M O *kyāh* ³ O *yasparṣād* ⁴ G M *-yāh* ⁵ G M *anye* ⁶ O om ⁷ W om

non-nasal, *sumnāyu sumnū* (11 13³ et al. O substitutes *sushun-nah*, 11 4 7¹), and that it must be followed by a nasal, *sabduh sagarah sumekah* (1v 4 7² G M omit *sumekah*, O substitutes *vashatt svāhā*, vii 3 12)

These examples are one-sided, in that they only exhibit the simplest form of group in which the *yama* is taken as increment. Of such simplest groups there are twenty-three met with in the Sanhita namely, after first mutes, *kn, kn, km, cñ, cm, tn, tn, tm, pn, pn, pm*, after second mutes, *chm, thn*, after third mutes, *gn, gm, gñ, jm, dn, dm*, after fourth mutes, *ghn, dhn, dhm, bhn*. Then, of groups of three consonants involving such combinations *ñy (ṇṇy), tny, ñchin, ññ (ñṇñ), dghn (dāgh-ññ), nghn, rñm (rññm), rtn, itm, rdhn, rdhm, stm (sst-ñm), sthn*. And of groups of four consonants, *rñny (rññny)*.

According to the phonetic systems of the other Prāticākhyas, this would finish the tale of *yamas*. But, by the peculiar rule (xiv 9) which here requires a surd mute to be everywhere inserted between a sibilant and a following nasal, is brought forth a new and numerous brood of these curious twms. Thus, in double groups, *gn (ṇṇ-ñn), gm, shn, shm, sn, sm*. Of groups of three containing these *gny, shnv, kshm (kḥshp-ñn), kshn, tsn, tsm, pñn, rñm (rññ-ñn), rshn, rshm, ssm*. Of groups of four, *ñkshn, hñkshn, ṇñny*. In all, of both classes, fifty-seven groups.

तान्यमानिके ॥ १३ ॥

13 Some call these *yamas*

The commentator adds nothing of value

हकारान्नणमपरान्नासिक्यम् ॥ १४ ॥

14 After *h*, when followed by *n*, *n*, or *m*, is inserted *nāsikya*

I have translated this rule according to its obvious and incontrovertible meaning, which, if it needed any external support, would find it in the almost precisely accordant rule of the Ath. Pr. (1100 the teachings of the other treatises upon the subject are much less distinct see the note on the Atharvan rule). But the commentator gives it an entirely different interpretation. The ablative *hakārān*, he says, is here used in the sense of an accusative (his addition, "in the absence of *lyup* [the suffix *yu*]," I do

13 *tān nāsikyān eke śākhino yamān bruvate¹, uktāny eva 'dāharanān*

¹ G M *in vadanti*

14 *hakārād iti karman¹ lyablope² pañcamī, tasmān nanama-parum hakāram āruhya nāsikyam bhavati³ śānunāsikyo hakārān syād ity arthah., ahnām.... apar..... brahm.....*

¹ W *ma* ² *lyupulope*, B *lyaplope*, O *lyaplope* ³ B *red iti*

not understand), and the sense is, that a nose sound is imposed upon the *h* itself, or that the latter becomes nasal. It is not difficult to see on what this theory of the quality of a *h* preceding a nasal is founded—namely, a recognition of the fact that such a *h* is really in expiration of breath through the nose it being not less true of *h* before a semivowel or nasal than before a vowel, that it is (borrowing the phraseology of an earlier rule, ii 47) *udāyaraṇaśāsthāna*, ‘produced in the position of the succeeding letter’. The commentator’s exposition might have come from the “some authorities” to whom the doctrine of that rule is attributed.

The examples given are *ahnām ketuh* (ii 4 14¹), *apānāhne* (ii 1 2⁵), and *brahmavādīnam* (i 7 1⁴ et al). Giving to the rule its real meaning, and applying the principle laid down at xxi 8 for the syllabic division, we should read *ahhⁿām* and so with the rest. As was suggested under Ath Pi i 100, it is probably this separation of the *h* from the nasal in syllabication that has led to the division of the two in point of utterance, and then to the thrusting in between them of a transition-sound.

G M have adapted the reading of the rule to the new interpretation, and give *hahāraṇaṇamaparaṇa nāsikyaṇa* (the writing of *n* instead of *m* before *n* is frequent with these MSS.)

रेफोष्मसंयोगे रेफस्वरभक्तिः ॥ १५ ॥

15 In the combination of *r* and a spirant, there is a *svara-bhakti* of *r*.

The doctrine of our Prātigākyā respecting the *svara-bhakti* is less detailed, and less distinctly expressed, than that of the other treatises (for which, see the note to Ath Prāt i 101–2), from the statement here made, we should not even understand that this “vowel-fragment” is to be an insertion between the *r* and the spirant, although that is doubtless intended to be signified. The commentator enters into a long exposition of the subject, by no means, however, limiting himself to explaining and illustrating his text. The two South-Indian manuscripts (G M) are in some parts of this exposition fuller than the rest, and will be followed

15 ‘rephaṣya¹⁰ ca ‘śhmanas¹¹ ca samyoge satī¹ rephasvarabhaktir¹² iti jānīyāt ‘svarasya bhaktiḥ svarabhaktiḥ²’ yo ‘sya rephasya samānāvṛtas³ tadbhaktiḥ syāt rkāras⁴ cā ‘sya jhuvāgrakarana-tveṇa⁵ iṣṭrutya⁶ iā⁷ samānadharmāḥ ‘bhaktir avayava eva⁸ deṣa⁹ iti yavat¹⁰ etad uktam bhavati rkāśāśayavo¹¹ bhavati ‘ty arthaḥ¹² sūtrenā ‘nenā svarabhaktir eva¹³ vilitā svarabhaktisvarāpam¹⁴ tu¹⁵ vīspashtam¹⁶ vyacashte vararuciḥ¹⁷ rkārādīr anumātrā¹⁸ repho ‘rdhamātrā madhye śeshā¹⁹ svarabhaktiḥ iti²⁰ asyā ‘yam arthaḥ²¹

indriyavishayo²² yo²³ ‘śāśv anur ity ucyate budhāḥ caturbhir²⁴ anubhir mātṛāparimānam²⁵ iti smṛtam²⁶

in the abstract of it here given the version of W B O, indeed, has rather the aspect of being an abbreviation of the other, and one not everywhere skilfully made

At the outset, G M alone specify that the *svanabhakti* is combined with the sputant (and yet, by xxi 6, it is to be separated from the sputant in syllabication, going with the *i* to the preceding vowel) The term *svanabhakti* means 'a fragment, piece, or part of a vowel,' and a *rephasvarabhakti*, 'r-vowel-fragment,' means a bit of the vowel that is akin, or has the same mode of utterance with, the *i* Now the *r* is of like quality with *i*, in being produced with the tip of the tongue and in having the sound of *r* and it is a part of *i* that is intended The rule merely prescribes the insertion, the nature of the latter is clearly set forth by Vararuci (one of the three principal sources of the present comment see note to the introductory verses, pp 6,7) The vowels are defined at 15, and since among them only *r* agrees in place and organ with *i*, the "fragment" is of *r* The *r* is by 131 declared to be short, or of one *mora*, and Vararuci defines the short *r* as composed of a quarter-mora of vowel at the beginning, a half-mora of *r* in the middle, and a quarter-mora of vowel (W B O say, of vowel-fragment) at the end Then a verse is quoted describing the word *anu* as signifying a quarter-mora This half-mora of *i*, now, found in the middle of *r*, being divided, its two parts, each combined with the quarter-mora of vowel, severally receive the name of *svanabhakti* Hence there are two *svanabhakti*'s And in answer to the question where this *svanabhakti* of half a *mora* occurs, the makers of the Çiksha have declared that the one ending with the vowel element occurs before *ç*, *sh*, and *s*, and the one ending with the consonant element before *h*, the former, moreover, being open, and the latter close And it is added that in *yo vā praddhām* (1681) there is no *svanabhakti*, on account of absence of the order prescribed in the rule

mātrikasya rkāśyā "dir anuātrā²¹ svarabhāgo mādhye rephe
'rdhamātrā²² gesho²³ 'py anuātrā²⁴ svanabhāgaḥ etad rkāśvasu-
rāpam atru²⁵ rephe 'rdhamātre bhayamāne²⁶ satī²⁷ tāu bhāyāu
pārvottarān²⁸ anusahitān²⁹ pratyekam svanabhaktināmadheyam
bhūyete³⁰ ³¹sā ca svanabhaktir urdhamātrā. kutr³² vā³³ svara-
bhaktir³⁴ ity āśāṅkya çikshāḥkārān³⁵ uktam

ças'aseshu svarodayam³⁶ hukāre vyañjanodayam³⁷
ças'aseshu tu³⁸ vīrtām³⁹ hukāre samvīrtām⁴⁰ vidur itī⁴¹
yo --- ityādāu⁴² sātīoktakamābhāvan na svarabhaktiḥ⁴³
svanabhaktiyantaram⁴⁴ çikshāyām uktam

⁴⁵karenū karvinī cāi 'va karvinī hārite⁴⁶ 'ti ca
hansapade⁴⁷ 'ti vijñeyāḥ pañcā 'tāḥ svarabhaktayuk.⁴⁸

⁴⁹karenū⁵⁰ ahayor⁵¹ yoge⁵² karvinī lahaḥārayoh
hūin⁵³ ⁵⁴raçasāndm ca⁵⁵ hāritā⁵⁶ laçakārayoh

So much by way of (would-be) explanation of the rule But the commentator goes on to say that the *Çikshā* teaches other *svarabhakti*'s, to the number of five namely, the *karenu*, between *r* and *h*, as in *barhah* (11 2¹ et al), the *karvini*, between *l* and *h*, as in *malhāh* (11 2⁴), the *harini*, between *r* and *ç* or *s*, as in *darçapūrnāṇḍāu* (11 2 5⁴ et al) and *barsam* (11 5 7¹), the *hāratā* (or *hanṛtā*), between *l* and *ç*, as in *sahasraivalçāh* (vi 3 3³), and the *hansapādā* (or *hansupādā*), between *r* and *sh*, as in *caśhāhvām* (11 4 10³)—and he who wants to go to heaven (on the score, no doubt, of patience, faith, and punctiliousness) must utter the five kinds of *bhakti*, as thus laid down It appears, then, that the commentator's *Çikshā*, like the *Vāj Pr* (iv 16), regards *l*, not less than *r*, as followed by *svarabhakti* before a spirant

न क्रमे प्रथमपरे प्रथमपरे ॥ १६ ॥

16 But not in case of *krama*, when a first mute follows the spirant

The commentator defines *krama* as the equivalent of *dvitva*, 'duplication,' and refers as authority to rule xxiv 5, where the word occurs again without, according to him, admitting any other meaning, whence, he infers, it must signify the same thing here also We should rather turn the argument the other way, and say that, as *krama* can have no other meaning here, it may be conjectured to signify the same thing at xxiv 5 He further coolly

⁵² *yā tu hansapādā nāma sā tu⁵³ repashakāruyoh*

⁵³ *evam pañcaviḍhām bhaktim uccaret svargakāṁkṣaḥ⁵⁴*

(¹) G M *rephashmanas sayyoge snti tatva ushmasayyukto* (²) G M *svarabhaktir*
iti kim ³ *edreṣṣi svarasya bhaktiḥ svarabhaktiḥ bhaktir* (⁴) *hagah* ⁵ *avayava* ⁶ *iti ekade a* ⁷ *iti*
⁸ *yāvat*, B O om *svarabhaktiḥ* ⁹ G M O *naka*, ¹⁰ *anasv-* ¹¹ O *nena* ¹² G M
¹³ *gruṇyā* ¹⁴ W *yana* ¹⁵ G M om, O *-ca* ¹⁶ *ity arthah* ¹⁷ W O *īkaru* ¹⁸ *eva y*, G
M *rkdasya* ¹⁹ *way-* ²⁰ G M *evam* ²¹ B om ²² O *spa-* (²³) G M *svara-* ²⁴ *īvat*
²⁵ *kimvāśhṣṭi* ²⁶ *iti cet* ²⁷ *shodh* ²⁸ *ḥ* ²⁹ *ḥ* ³⁰ *ḥ* ³¹ *ḥ* ³² *ḥ* ³³ *ḥ* ³⁴ *ḥ* ³⁵ *ḥ* ³⁶ *ḥ* ³⁷ *ḥ* ³⁸ *ḥ* ³⁹ *ḥ* ⁴⁰ *ḥ* ⁴¹ *ḥ* ⁴² *ḥ* ⁴³ *ḥ* ⁴⁴ *ḥ* ⁴⁵ *ḥ* ⁴⁶ *ḥ* ⁴⁷ *ḥ* ⁴⁸ *ḥ* ⁴⁹ *ḥ* ⁵⁰ *ḥ* ⁵¹ *ḥ* ⁵² *ḥ* ⁵³ *ḥ* ⁵⁴ *ḥ* ⁵⁵ *ḥ* ⁵⁶ *ḥ* ⁵⁷ *ḥ* ⁵⁸ *ḥ* ⁵⁹ *ḥ* ⁶⁰ *ḥ* ⁶¹ *ḥ* ⁶² *ḥ* ⁶³ *ḥ* ⁶⁴ *ḥ* ⁶⁵ *ḥ* ⁶⁶ *ḥ* ⁶⁷ *ḥ* ⁶⁸ *ḥ* ⁶⁹ *ḥ* ⁷⁰ *ḥ* ⁷¹ *ḥ* ⁷² *ḥ* ⁷³ *ḥ* ⁷⁴ *ḥ* ⁷⁵ *ḥ* ⁷⁶ *ḥ* ⁷⁷ *ḥ* ⁷⁸ *ḥ* ⁷⁹ *ḥ* ⁸⁰ *ḥ* ⁸¹ *ḥ* ⁸² *ḥ* ⁸³ *ḥ* ⁸⁴ *ḥ* ⁸⁵ *ḥ* ⁸⁶ *ḥ* ⁸⁷ *ḥ* ⁸⁸ *ḥ* ⁸⁹ *ḥ* ⁹⁰ *ḥ* ⁹¹ *ḥ* ⁹² *ḥ* ⁹³ *ḥ* ⁹⁴ *ḥ* ⁹⁵ *ḥ* ⁹⁶ *ḥ* ⁹⁷ *ḥ* ⁹⁸ *ḥ* ⁹⁹ *ḥ* ¹⁰⁰ *ḥ*

inserts an "or" in the rule, and declares it to mean 'either when the spirant is doubled or when it is followed by a first mute' This must evidently be condemned for, in the first place, the text contains no "or," and, in the second place, if that were the meaning, the specification would be superfluous, since the spirant is always doubled before a first mute, and so *krāme* would include all the cases—except, indeed, according to the doctrine of Plakṣhi and Plakṣhayana, who (xiv 17) deny the duplication of the spirant in such a situation, and we are perhaps to connect his interpretation of the present rule with his apparent acceptance of the doctrine referred to, and suppose that he would read *rsh-t*, and *rgp-ṣm* etc (namely, for *rgm*, *rshu*, and *rshm*), while the reading actually approved by the treatise is *rshsh t*, *rggp-ṣm* etc. There are five groups—namely *rgy*, *rgv*, *rshy*, *rsv*, and *rhy*—in which the difference of interpretation would make a difference as regards the presence or absence of *svarabhakti*, if the "or" is implied, they will be read and divided *rg gy* etc., if not, they will be *r'gy gy* etc.

The commentator's examples are *dārgyam yañam* (iii 2 2³ only O has *yañam*, G M read *dārgyam ha*, which, if it be an actual passage, I have overlooked in searching out the references), *varshyābhyah* (vii 4 13 W B O read *varshābhyah*), *barsvebhah* (v 7 11), and *etarhy āśādheh* (v. 1 5⁵ found in O only), illustrating four of the five cases in which his interpretation would exclude the *svarabhakti*, and further, for cases in which a first mute follows, *adargma jyotih* (iii 2 5⁴ omitted in O), *kārshnī upānahāu* (v 4 4⁴ et al.), and *varshā parjanyah* (vii 5 20 found in G M only)

CHAPTER XXII

CONTENTS 1-2, formation of articulate sounds in general, 3-8, definition of terms used in the treatise, 9-10, mode of production of high and low tone, 11-12, established tone and pitch, 13, length of pauses in the text, 14-15, heavy and light syllables

16. *'krāmagabdo dvitvaparyāyah katham etat prakṛtir v-krāmāk kramā* (xxiv 5) *ity atra dvitvasyā¹ 'na' kramagabdenā² 'bhadrānād atrā³ 'pī sa evā⁴ 'ītha iti nīcānumah⁵ 'ishmanā krame sati⁶ tasmān āśmanā prathamapare vā⁷ sati na svarābhaktir bhavati⁸ 'krāme yathā⁹ dārg-.... varsh-.... bars - - 'prathamapare yathā ad-....¹⁰ kār - - -¹¹ prathamāḥ paro yasmād asān prathanāparah*

iti tribhīḥshyarcine prāṭiśākhyaḥ
ekavengo¹² 'dhyāyah

(¹) O om (²) G M *tvam asty e* (³) W *bdo nāma* (⁴) W *rvā* (⁵) G M *'rīho nīcātāh* (⁶) O om, G M add *va*. (⁷) G M put after *sati* (⁸) W *vet* (⁹) O om. (¹⁰) O. *etar-*, G M *etasya prathamaparo y-* (¹¹) G M add *varshā* d... (¹²) G M O *dvitvanārcine nānumā*

शब्दः प्रकृतिः सर्ववर्णानाम् ॥ १ ॥

1 Tone is the material of all articulate sounds

The putting-together, as well as the material, of this and the following chapter is rather peculiar, and makes the impression of a supplement to the *Prātiśākhya* proper. This present rule and its successor are akin with the first two of the next chapter, and all these with the rules of the second chapter. As under 11, the commentator explains *śabda* by *dhvani*, for *prakṛti* he gives as synonym *mālakāraṇam*, 'radical cause,' and *varṇa* he declares to designate the whole congeries of vowels and consonants.

तस्य रूपान्यवे वर्णान्यवम् ॥ २ ॥

2 In the difference of form of the former consists the difference of the latter

That is to say, in the difference resulting from the variety of positions giving audible quality compare 11 3

तत्र शब्दद्रव्याण्युदाहरिष्यामः ॥ ३ ॥

3 Here we will instance the offices of terms .

A complete and violent change of subject is introduced by this rule, continuing to rule 9, which last, again, attaches itself closely enough to the beginning of the chapter to have been its natural continuation. The intervening batch of rules looks like an interpolation, thrust in at this point *apropos* of *śabda* in rule 1, the word being taken here, however, in an entirely different sense. The commentator tries to smooth over the transition by pronouncing *śabda* a synonym of *śāstra*, 'text-book, body of doctrine,' which latter is formed by the putting to use of combinations of the alphabetic sounds just above spoken of. He distinctly ascribes to *śavya* the sense of 'office, aim,' as the connection also requires,

1 *sarvavarṇānām*¹ *śabdo*² *dhvaniḥ prakṛtiḥ mālakāraṇam bhavati* *varṇaśabdena svaravyaṅgunātmaḥ rāgar ucyaṭe sarve ca te varṇāḥ ca sarvavarṇāḥ*³ *teshām*⁴

¹ G M om ² G M ins *nāma* ³ O om ⁴ G M add *sarvavarṇānām*

2 *prātiśrutkusthānabhedāt*¹ *tasya*² *prakṛtibhūtasya*³ *rūpānyatve sati varṇānyatvam syāt*⁴ *yathā a i u ityādi*

¹ B *prat-*, G M *nābhe* ² G M ins *śabdasya* ³ W *prati* ⁴ O om

3 *teshām varṇānām sarvatra*¹ *saṃghātaprayoge*² *śāstram*³ *ity*⁴ *ucyaṭe* ⁵ *tasya śabda*⁶ *iti paryāyanāna tatra tasmān chāstre yāni dravyāni bhavanti tāny udāharishyāmaḥ yat karma yena kriyate*⁷ *tat*⁸ *tasya dravyam*⁹ *sādhanaṃ* *iti yāvat*¹⁰ *yathā gha-*

giving *sādhana*, 'efficiency,' as its equivalent. As clay to a vessel, we are told, so are alphabetic sounds to a text-book

वर्णकारौ निर्देशकौ ॥ ४ ॥

4 *Vaṇa* and *kāra* are indicatory

These two terms have already formed the subject of rules 1 16-20. Rules vi 1, 7 are cited as examples of their use

चार्यान्वदिशकौ ॥ ५ ॥

5 *Cā* and *apī* are implicative

Rules vi 3 and iv 4 are cited as containing examples of the use of these signs of continued implication from something that has gone before

तथैवेति विनिवर्तकाधिकारकावधारकाः ॥ ६ ॥

6 *Tu*, *atha*, and *eva* are exceptional, introductory, and restrictive, respectively

The use of these connectives is instanced by quoting rules 1 19, v 1, and xiv 3 (G M substitute vii 1 for the second)

These rules are too trivial and superficial to make it worth while to enter, in connection with them, into any discussion of the use of the particles in the text of the *Prāṭigākhya*. The index, and the notes on each rule, will give the means of investigating the matter. We have often had occasion to animadvert upon the commentator's

*tasya mrd ity evam śāstrasya varnāh¹² yāni dravyāni samvya-
hā arthāni kartavyāni tāni vyākhyāsyāmaḥ śabdasya dravyāni
śabdadravyāni tāni*

¹ O -ta ² O ins vā ³ W -tre ⁴ W B *katham*, O om ⁵ W B ins *tasya rūpāni* ⁶ W O -bda ⁷ O *pradarśayishy-* ⁸ O *karmayate* ⁹ W *tatra*, B *na* ¹⁰ B -ya, M om ¹¹ O om ¹² W -na, G M -nānām, O *savarnah*

4 *varnaśabdāḥ kāśaśbdaś ca nirdeśakāu¹ nirdeśavācakāu²
syātām yathā. avarnavyañjanaśakuni (vi 7) iti atha
śhakarāñ śakāravīsarjanīyāv (vi 1) iti varnaś ca kāraś
ca varnakārāu*

¹ G M om ² W B *deśakāu vāc*, O om

5 *ca apī ity etāv¹ anvādeśakāu syātām pūrvāpekṣhayā²
'nvādeśa ity ucyate. yathā asaśāmāsiñcañś ca (vi 3). iti-
paro 'pī (iv 4)*

¹ G M ins *śabdāu* ² W B *pūrvapakṣo*, O *pūvo pakṣo*

6 *tu. atha eva ity ete śabdā yathākramena¹ vinivartakā-
dhikārakāvāghārakā bhavanti yatra tuśabdāḥ grāyate tatra*

tendency to put into them (especially into *tu*) a meaning which they were never intended to bear

वेति वैभाषिकः ॥ ७ ॥

7 *Vā* is alternative

Rule 1150 is quoted as example

नेति प्रतिषेधकः ॥ ८ ॥

8 *Nā* is prohibitive

The example this time is xiii 15 (G M substituting xiv 14), and in it appear again some of the differences of reading which were noted in the rule itself where it occurred

आयामो दारुण्यमणुता खस्येत्यच्चैः कराणि शब्दस्य ॥ ९ ॥

9 Tension, hardness smallness of aperture, are producers of high tone

Reference is made to rule 138, in which the acute accent is defined as consisting in high tone, and the present precept is declared to be given for the sake of that, and in order to prohibit that slack or indifferent utterance which prevails in common life. *Āyama*, 'tension,' is explained as meaning rather 'extension (literally 'longness') of the members,' *dārunya*, as 'severity of the vowel,' and *anuta kṣasya*, as 'closure of the orifice of the throat' this is what one who would utter a sound in high tone must do

There is evidently much more guess-work than true observation in this rule and the one next following if they had been given as definitions of sonant and surd utterance, instead of high and low

nivṛttih yatrā 'thaṣabdas tatrā 'dhikārah yatrā 'vaṣabdas ta-
trā 'vadhāranam ² *veditavyam yathā ephas tu rasya* (i 19)
³ *atha sañhātāyām ekapṛānubhāve* (v 1) ⁴ *sparṣa* ⁵ *evā*
⁶ *keshām ācāryānām* (xiv 3) *viśeshena nivartayati 'ti vni-*
vartakah adhikaroti 'ty adhikārah ⁷ *avadhārayati 'ty ava-*
dhārah

¹ G M *man* ² G M O *ins ce 'n* ³ G M *atha nakāro nakaram* (vii 1) ⁴ O *om* ⁵ G M *-apara* ⁶ W O G M *-rah*

7 *ve 'ty esha ṣabdo vābhdāshiko* ¹ *vākalpiko bhavati yathā mukhaṇḍīkyā vā* (ii 50)

¹ G M *shako* (as also in the rule)

8. *ne 'ty esha ṣabdah pratishedhako bhavati* ¹ *yathā 'na shumnognir* (xiii 15) *iti* ²

¹ G M O *syāt* ² G M *atha na* (xiv 14), B *na sushu*, O *na sum-*, W B *-gm 'n*

tone, they might more easily have been regarded as describing real processes of articulation

अन्ववसर्गो मर्दवमूर्ता खस्येति नचिकराणि ॥१०॥

10 Relaxation, softness, wideness of aperture, are producers of low tone

The exposition of this rule runs quite parallel with that of the preceding (only O, however, referring to the definition of *anvādatta*, 'grave,' as of low tone, at 139). To *anvavasarga* is given *vinatātā*, 'drooping condition,' as synonym, to *mārdava*, *snigdhatā*, 'smoothness,' and to *urutā*, *sthūlatā*, 'bigness'. There is nothing at all to commend in such a description of the way in which low tone is produced

मन्द्रमध्यमताराणि स्थानानि भवन्ति ॥११॥

11 Soft, middle, and loud are the three qualities

Then use, we are told, will be explained farther on—namely, in rules 4–10 of the next chapter. I have ventured to render *sthāna*,¹ literally 'place' or 'position,' by 'quality,' as better expressing the nature of the distinctions implied. The name apparently comes from such theories as that laid down in rule xxiii 10 as to the "place" of production of the different qualities of tone.

In answer, we are told, to the suggested inquiry, "of what are

9 *uccāra udātta* (138) *ity uktam tadartham idam ārabh-yate lokavad yādārchiloccāranapatisedhārtham*¹ *āyāmo gā-trānām dāruṅghyam dāruṇyam svarasya kathinatā* *anutā kha-sya galuvvarasya*² *saṁvartatā*³ *etāni sādhanāni*⁴ *ṣabdasyo* *ccāh-kaṛāni*⁵ *ṣabdam uccāra udāttam kurvanti*⁶ *ty arthah uccaṣabdam uccārayatāi*⁷ *tat kartavyam ite vidhih*⁸ *uccāh kurvanti*⁹ *ty uccaṣhkarāni*¹⁰

¹ W *yavach*, B *hadach*, W B O *rthah* ⁽²⁾ W om ³ B *virarunasya*, G M *virarunasya*, and put after *saṁvartatā* (B O *mtā*) ⁴ G M *namadhyani* ⁵ W *ccāh* ⁽⁶⁾ G M om ⁽⁷⁾ W G M om ⁸ B adds *kapanini*, and om the following rule

10 ¹ *anvavasargo gātrānām vinatātā*² *mārdavam svarasya snigdhatā khasyo*³ *rutā kunthasya sthūlate*⁴ *ty*⁵ *etāni sādhanāni ṣabdasyo nīcāhkarāni ṣabdam nīcam anudāttam*⁶ *kurvanti*⁷ *ty arthah nīcaṣabdam uccārayatāi*⁸ *tat kartavyam ite vidhih nīcāh kurvanti*⁹ *te nīcāhkarāni*

⁽¹⁾ O ins *nīcār anudatta* (139) *ity uktam* ² G M O *vinatātā* ³ G M om *ite* ⁴ G M *ud* ⁵ W *uddhārayam*, B *-yan*, G M *-ranayatā* O *ranatā*

11 *mandram madhyamam tāram ce*¹ *ti*² *sthānāni bhavanti*³ *mandram ite prathamam madhyamam ite dvitīyam tāram ite*

these positions or qualities?" the subject is continued in the next rule

तत्रैकविंशतिर्यमाः ॥ १२ ॥

12 *In them are twenty one tones

For the application of these tones or keys, also, we are referred to a later passage (xxiii 11 etc) As synonym of *yama* is given *svara*, 'tone'

The commentator chooses to connect these rules with those that follow in the next chapter, and to overlook the obvious fact that in the two chapters we have separate and independent statements upon the same subject, which cannot have come from the same hand, and of which the second renders the first wholly superfluous

ऋग्विरामः पदविरामो विवृत्तिविरामः समानपदवि-
वृत्तिविरामस्त्रिमात्रो द्विमात्र एकमात्रो ऽर्धमात्र इत्या-
नुपूर्व्येण ॥ १३ ॥

13 The verse pause, *pada* pause, pause for hiatus, and pause for hiatus in the interior of a word, are respectively of three *moras*, two *moras*, one *mora*, and a half *mora*

As example of the pause of three *moras* at the end of a verse is quoted *ubhā vāṇsya sātaye huve vām* (i 5 5² O omits the first two words), of the pause of two *moras*, in *pada*-text, between the *padas*, *ishe tvā ūrje tvā* (i 11 1 et al) and, for all that the Pīṭigākhyā tells us, we are to regard the *avagraha* pause, dividing the two parts of a compound word, as of the same length (the Rik [i 6, r 29] and Vājasaneyi [v 1] Pīṭigākhyas give it only one *mora*), of the hiatus pause, *sa idhānah* (iv 4 4⁵), *ta enam* (ii 3 11⁴), and *tā asmāt* (ii 4 4¹ W prefixes *ā*, but doubtless only by

trīṇyam eteshām² sthānānām prayojanam uttaratra⁴ vakshyate
**etāni sthānāni keshām ityapekshāyām āha parasātran⁵*

(1) G M om (2) O 'ty etāni (3) G M O esh- (4) B uttaratra (5) O om

12 *teshu¹ sthāneshu ekaviṃśatur yamāḥ svarā bhavanti teshām*
yamānām uttaratra prayojanam vakshyate

¹ O *tatra trishu*, B adds *trishu*

13 *rgvāmādayas trimātri ādikālā¹ yathākramam² bhavanti*
yathā³ ubhā---- ity rgvāmāḥ ishe---- iti padavāmāḥ
sa---- tā---- tā---- iti vivrttvirāmāḥ praugam iti samā-
napadavivrttvirāmāḥ 'rci⁴ virāma rgvirāmāḥ padasya virā-
māḥ padavirāmāḥ padadvayavivrttāu⁵ virāmo vivrttvirāmāḥ¹
śikshāyām⁶ asya viśeṣa uktāḥ

a copyist's blunder), of the pause of interior hiatus, *pruvigam* (iv 4 2¹), which is, I believe, the only case. The commentator also quotes a couple of verses from his *Ḍikṣha*, laying down four subdivisions of the pause of hiatus, and assigning them different quantities that between a short and long vowel is *vatsānusṛti*, and is one *mora* long, that between a long and following short is *vatsānusārinī*, of the same length, between two short vowels, *pākavati*, three quarters of a *mora*, between two long vowels, *pīpīlākā*, a quarter-*mora* only (Uvata's comment on the *Rik Prat* [ii 1] states the intervals quite differently). In W there are two verses which are not found in the rest, as they stand, their meaning is in great part obscure to me, and I prefer to leave them unamended and untranslated

यद्यज्ञानात् यद्वा चापि दीर्घः
 संयोगपूर्व च तथानुनासिकम् ॥
 एतानि सर्वाणि गुत्राणि विद्याच्च
 हेषाण्यतो ज्ञेयानि ततो लघूनि ॥ १४ ॥

14 A syllable that ends with a consonant, one that has a long vowel, one that precedes a conjunction of consonants, one that is nasal—all these are to be accounted heavy, the rest, other than these, are light

**pīpīlākā* *dirghasame* *ca* *madhye*

savarnatā *pākavati* *padākye*

dr̥ṣṭvā *ca* *vatsānusṛjas* *tv* *asāmye*

tv *atho* 'ca' *mukhyas* *tu* *va* *āmukālah* 1

svurodaye *tv* *anusvā* *o* *bhaved* *adhyamunātrikah*

virāmag *ca* *tayor* *madhye* *vāḍṣeshukāc* *ca* *dirghayoh* 2⁹

hrasvādūr *vatsānusṛtir*¹⁰ *ante* *vatsānusārinī*

pākavaty *ubhayahrasvā*¹¹ *dū* *ghobhayā*¹² *pīpīlākā*

¹³ *mātrā*¹⁴ *ca*¹⁵ *vatsānusṛtis*¹⁶ *tathā* *vatsānusārinī*

pādonā *syāt* *pākavati* *pādāmā* *tā* *pīpīlākā*¹⁸

¹⁷ *samānam* *ca* *tat* *padam* *ca* *samānapadam* *ekupadam* *ity* *arthah*¹⁷ ¹⁸ *samānapade* *vivrttiḥ* *samānapadavivrttiḥ* *tasyām*¹⁹ *virāmah*²⁰ *samānapadavivrttiḥ* *virāmah* ²¹ *tisro* *mātrā* *yasyā* 'sāu *trumātrah* ²² *dvē* *mātre* *yasyā* 'sāu *dvimātrah* *ekā* *mātrā* *yasyā* 'sāu *ekamātrah* *ardhā* *mātrā* *yasyā* 'sāu *ardhamātrah*²²

¹ W -trak ² O mena ³ G M om ⁴ O puts below, at ¹⁸ ⁵ W rg, G M rco ⁶ B padavi, O yamādhye vivrtti ⁷ W B om, O padamv. ⁸ G M ins apy ⁹ in W only ¹⁰ W tsānyasṛti-madhyer, G M nusātir ¹¹ B -yoh, G M yeh- ¹² G M -ghayos tu ¹³ O om ¹⁴ G M trikā ¹⁵ G M om ¹⁶ W nusṛjanti, G M -nikṛts ¹⁷ O puts below, at ²¹ ¹⁸ O puts ¹⁹ here ²⁰ W om, B smā, ²¹ sya ²² W om ²³ O puts ²⁴ here ²⁵ in G. M only

The commentator instances the different kinds of "heavy" syllable, as follows one ending with a consonant, *māte 'va putram* (iv 2 3² et al G M omit), one long by its vowel, *te te 'dhipatayah* (iv 4 11³ G M omit the last word), one followed by a consonant-group, *aṁā ca me* (iv 7 5¹ W has *ānmāyṇā*, which appears to be merely a corrupt reading, I have found nothing at all like it in the Sanhita), one that is nasal, *viñcatyāri* (vii 2 13 et al)

The distinction of the syllable as "heavy" or "light" has value only in a metrical point of view, and does not make its appearance elsewhere in our treatise (except as it is referred to in rule xlii 5—which rule we might have expected the commentator to quote here, as the occasion of this one) The quality of "long" or "short" belongs to the vowel alone, and (see xxi 1 and its comment) the consonants accompanying the latter are regarded as absorbed into it, and forming part of its natural quantity This separation of "heavy" and "long," or of weight and quantity, is practically convenient, perhaps, but theoretically indefensible, and we have reason to be surprised that phonetic observers so acute as the Hindus had not worked the theory of syllabic quantity into a more consistent shape The other treatises agree with this see Ath Pr 151-54, and notes

The use of the word *anunāsika* in describing a syllable containing *anusvāra* is (as already noted, under ii 30) one more sign of a theory which regards the *anusvāra* as a quality and not an element The Ath Prāt, which holds this theory, uses the same term in its definition (158). It deserves to be noted, however, that to read *anunāsikam* instead of *anunāsika* in the verse would help the metric, making the following lines similar

This rule is enough by itself to determine the weight of any syllable whatever but, as the commentator points out, the one following is added to resolve any doubts which might after all arise as to what syllables were light

14 *vyāñjanāntam yad aksharam 'vyāñjanam ante' yasya tad vyāñjanāntam* ¹ *yad u cā 'pi dīrgham* ² *aksharam* ³ *samyogapūrvam ca yad aksharam* ⁴ *samyogāt pūrvam* ⁵ *samyogapūrvam* ⁶ *tathā 'nūnāsikam sāmūnāsikam* ⁷ *yad aksharam* ⁸ *uktāny etāni sarvāny aksharāni gurāni vidyāt jñīyāt yathā* ⁹ *vyāñjanāntam māte....* ¹⁰ *yathā dīrgham te....* ¹¹ *yathā sāmīyogapūrvam aṁā ...* ¹² *yathā 'nūnāsikam* ¹³ *viñcatyāri* ¹⁴ *ṣeṣhāny ato 'nyāni* ¹⁵ *ata' eḥhyo gurubhyah ṣeṣhāny anyāny aksharāni* ¹⁶ *tato 'nanturam* ¹⁷ *laghāni vyāñīyāt* ¹⁸ *ṣeṣhāni* ¹⁹ *kāni* ²⁰ *'ty āṇkyo 'taraplokena* ²¹ *vivṛnoti*

(1) G M put at beginning (2) G M tam (3) G M ins yad (4) G M ins yogāt pūrvam (5) G M om (6) B G M om (7) O gam (8) O om (9) G M anu (10) G M vyāñjanāntam ity atra (11) G M om (12) O puts before yathā (13) B omits from here to the middle of rule 15 (beginning again with samyogapūrvam) (14) G M O ins. tato laghāni (15) W eta (16) G M om (17) G M jñ- (18) W -ni 'h (19) W -le

अव्यञ्जनान्तं यद्भ्रस्वमसंयोगपरं च यत् ।

अननुस्वारसंयुक्तमेतल्लघु निबोधतै ।

तल्लघु निबोधत ॥ १५ ॥

15 A syllable that does not end with a consonant, that has a short vowel, and that is not followed by a conjunction of consonants, and one that is not combined with *anusvāra*—know that to be light

This is a mere negative to the preceding rule, and a wholly superfluous addition to it—and an addition made, we may conjecture, by a different and later hand the use of the term *anusvāra* distinctly suggests this

The commentator quotes, by way of example of light syllables, simply *madudāyanaśasan* (vi 1 5¹ B O omit the last word)

CHAPTER XXIII

CONTENTS 1-3, causes of the differences of articulated sounds, 4-10, qualities or temperaments of voice, 11-19, tone or pitch of utterance, 20, general mode of correct utterance

अथ वर्णविशेषोत्पत्तिः ॥ १ ॥

1 Now for the origin of the differences of articulate sounds.

15 'avyañjanāntam yad akṣharam yac ca hrasvam yac 'cā 'samyogaparam² yac cā 'nanusvārasamyuktam etat sarvam akṣharam laghu³ nibodhata⁴ jñānīdhvam yathā⁵ mad----- ityādi vyañjanam ante⁶ yasya tad vyañjanāntam 'na vyañjanāntam avyañjanāntam⁷ samyogah paro yasmāt tat samyogaparam⁸ 'na samyogaparam⁹ asamyogaparam¹⁰ anusvārena samyuktam¹¹ anusvārasamyuktam¹² 'nā 'nusvā asamyuktam¹³ ananusvārasamyuktam

ita tribhāṣhyaratne prāticākhyaavarane
dādvā¹⁴go¹⁵ 'dhyāyah

(¹) G M om (²) W ca samyogapūrvam (³) W B laghu (⁴) W om (⁵) G¹⁶ M antam (⁶) W om (⁷) G M tadbhinnam (⁸) O om, W yuktam only (⁹) B om, G M anusvārayogavrahitam (¹⁰) G M O dvitīyapraçne daçamo

1 athe 'ty ayam adhikārah. varnānām viśeṣhotpattir ucyata ity etad adhikṛtam vedāvyam ita uttaram yad vakshyāmaḥ. varnānām viśeṣo varnaviśeṣaḥ tasyo 'tpattir sā tatho 'ktā

It was hardly worth while to give a rule introductory to so very brief a treatment of the subject as is here to follow

अनुप्रदानात्संस्पर्गात्स्थानात्करणविन्ययात् ।

जायते वर्णविशेष्यं परिमाणाच्च पञ्चमाद् इति ॥ २ ॥

2 The differentiation of articulate sounds arises from emission, closure, position, disposition of producing organ, and, fifthly, from quantity

That is to say, according as any sound is different from another in respect to one or more of these five constituent or determining elements, so its nature or quality is different. The *anuprādāna* is the emitted material, whether tone, breath, or the intermediate *h*-sound (11 8-10), by *saṅsarga* (a term not elsewhere used) is doubtless intended the degree of approximation of the articulating organs, as contact (*spargana*, 11 33), approach (*upasaṅhāra*, 11 31), and the like (11 14, 16, 45 etc.), *sthāna*, 'place, position,' and *kāraṇa*, 'producing organ,' are the familiar names given respectively to the more passive and the more active of the two parts of the mouth by whose contact or approach the sound receives its articulate character (*vinnyaya*, which the commentator explains by *vinnyāsa* [B reads this in the rule itself], seems to be added more to make up the verse than for the sake of its meaning), *parimāṇa*, 'measure' (used only here), is synonymous with *kāla*, 'time, quantity' (see 1 31-37). The commentator takes *a* as an example, and says of it that its "emitted material" is tone, its "closure," in the throat, its "position," the two jaws, and its "disposition of producing organ," the two lips. Excepting in the first item, this is blundering work. *a* is, of all the alphabetic sounds, the one least easy to try by the tests laid down in this rule, and the commentator would have done well to choose some more manageable illustration.

वर्णप्रकृतः शब्दो वाच उत्पत्तिः ॥ ३ ॥

3 Sound combined with articulation is the origin of voice

The commentator defines *prkta* by *miṣra*, 'mixed,' and *utpatti*

2 *anuprādānādibhūḥ pañcabhūḥ¹ kāraṇān varnavāṛṣeṣhyam² jāyate akārasya tāvad anuprādānam nādaḥ samsargah kanthe sthānam hanā karanavinnyaya³ oṣṭhāu vinnyayo nāma vinnyāsaḥ⁴ parimāṇam⁵ mātrākālah⁶ evaṁ suravarnānām boddhavṛṣṭam viśeṣabhāvo⁷ vāṛṣeṣhyam varnānām vāṛṣeṣhyam varnavāṛṣeṣhyam⁸*

¹ G M om ² G M O -nānām v- ³ O -nyasa ⁴ W O param-, as also (with T) in the rule ⁵ G M O -śhasya bh ⁶ W O om, G M tāḥ

3 *prkto miṣra ity arthaḥ varnavāṛṣaḥ¹ śabdo vāco vākyasyo*

by *upādāna* and *kāraṇa*, 'cause' This combination denies the quality of voice to the mere "sound" of drums and the like

सप्त वाच स्थानानि भवन्ति ॥ ४ ॥

4 Of voice, there are seven qualities

Here is a different and expanded version of the doctrine of three qualities, as laid down above, in rule xxii 11 The following rules give the details The commentator gives of *sthāna* the lucid definition "those whereby the voice is put to use, and that wherein it stands—that is *sthāna*"

उपांशुधाननिमदोपब्दिमन्मन्द्रमध्यमताराणि ॥ ५ ॥

5 Namely, inaudible, murmur, whisper, mumbling, soft, middle, and loud

The rules that follow define the senses in which we are to understand the terms here given They indicate plainly enough a continual progression, from inaudible and merely mental utterance up to loud and distinct speaking, but it is not easy to find words which shall represent them closely

करणावदशब्दमनःप्रयोगमुपांशु ॥ ६ ॥

6 "Inaudible" is without sound, without application of mind, but with articulating action

The commentator explains *karanavat* by *prayatnavat*, 'with effort,' and states its object to be to deny absolute silence to the *upāṅgu* "Without sound" signifies the exceeding littleness of

'*upattir upādānam¹ kāraṇam bhavati varṇaprakṛta itī kum dundubhyādīṣabdhānāni vākyatā² mā bhūḍ itī*

¹ MSS -ra ² B G M O -na ³ B tvam

4 '*vacah sapta sthānāni bhavanti¹ tāny uttarasūtre vakshyante yān vāk² prayujyate³ yasminṇ ca tiṣṭhati tat⁴ sthānam tāni yathāḥkramam udāharishyāmaḥ*

1 (A) G M om ² B -kyam ³ B yuj , W O add se ⁴ O om

5 *upāṅgu itī prathamam vāca sthānam dhvāna¹ itī dvitīyam nīmada² itī tritīyam evam utarāny api nāmataḥ sapta³ tāni sthānāni jānīyāt uparitanam⁴ sūtram ārabhya⁵ pratyekam eṣām lakṣhanam⁶ vakshyate⁷*

¹ O -nam, G M -nam ² O -dam ³ B O na ⁴ G M sthānānām ⁵ G M lak-

6 *karanavat prayatnavat ity arthah nā 'stri ṣabdo dhvanir asminn ity¹ ṣabdam² manasā prayogo manahprayogaḥ³, nā 'stri*

sound in this mode of utterance "Without application of mind" excludes any intentional use of *udatta* etc. This last is not very satisfactory, and, indeed, we should as soon expect the contrary term, *manahprayoga*, 'with application of mind,' to be read, as indicating an utterance in which the mind does its full part, though not the voice also (G M, in fact, read it in the rule)

अक्षरव्यञ्जनानामनुपलब्धिर्धानः ॥ ७ ॥

7 "Murmur" is inaudibleness of syllables and consonants

The commentator explains *akshara*, 'syllables,' as meaning here 'vowels,' but there seems no need of refusing the word its ordinary signification. Inaudibleness, we are further told, being a characteristic of *upāṅgu* also, it is here again specified in order to teach that there is no actual sound heard. Of what follows, a great part has dropped out in B G M, and is much corrupted in the other two manuscripts, so as to be very obscure. The separate mention of syllables and consonants is for the sake of clearness (?), and indicates exceeding inaudibleness and there is added a comparison with tame and wild cattle, of which I fail to make any sense. Others say that the inaudibleness is of *s*, *h*, and so on. All of which is very trivial and unedifying.

उपलब्धिर्निमदः ॥ ८ ॥

8 "Whisper" is their audibleness

manahprayogo yasmīn¹ ity amanaḥprayogam² vāca sthānam idr̥gam³ upāṅgu ity upadiśyate tatra karanarad itī tūshnimbhāvanīrttyartham⁴ aśabdām itī śabdasyā⁵ 'tyantālpatārtham⁶ amanaḥprayogam ity udātādīnām sāmkalpikaprayogapratishe-dhārtham⁷

¹ W B put before *asmīn* ² G M -dah ³ W *manah*, B -gah *stvam*, O *manasah pr-* ⁴ G M O 'smīn ⁵ G M *gah* ⁶ W *sthānam vaca ichvam* ⁷ G M *thah* ⁸ G M *thah* ⁹ G M *samkalpapakapratī*, B G M -*thah*

7 aksharāṇi svarāḥ aksharāṇām vyañyanānām¹ cā 'nupalabdhīr dīhvāno nāma dvitīyam vāca sthānam upāṅgulakshane 'py anupalabdhīn satyām punarvacanam² aśabdopalabdhīrvādhānārtham³ 'aksharavyaṅyanānām bhēdagrahanam⁴ abhākhyārtham⁵ atyantānupalabdhīr⁶ ity arthah⁷ anye tv⁸ āhuh⁹ aksharavyaṅyanānām savisaṅjanīyādīnām¹⁰ anupalabdhīr itī

¹ G M *svārāṇām* ² W B *cana*, O -*camam* ³ W B O *śabd-*, G M *rthah* ⁴ B G M om ⁵ O *bhēdena gr-* ⁶ W *ābhakṣayayartham*, O *ābh* ⁷ O -*nta-pal-* ⁸ W ms *yāmānyasya paṣor arāmanasya pr tīcyam itī*, O ms *yatha na grāmānyasya paṣor ante nārānyasādīhyetacyam itī* ⁹ O om *tu* ¹⁰ G M *vis*

8. *aksharavyaṅyanānām upalabdhīr nimadō nāma tritīyam vāca sthānam bhavati*

I have rendered *nmāda* by 'whisper' rather at a venture whether the word accurately represents it or not is at any rate of very small consequence

सशब्दमुपबिम्बम् ॥ १ ॥

9 "Mumbling" is the same, with sound

Ābda would seem to be used here in the sense of *nāda*, 'tone,' if the definition is to be made anything of, the term *upabdimat* is found in the Tāttirīya-Saṁhitā (at III 1 9¹), used in antithesis to *upāṁsu*

उरसि मन्द्रं कण्ठे मध्यमं शिरसि तारम् ॥ १० ॥

10 "Soft" is in the chest, "middle" in the throat, "loud" in the head

The South-Indian manuscripts (G M) divide this rule into three, and break up the comment into three corresponding parts, without other change I presume that the treatment of the whole as one rule is more original, the subject joins on, as it were, to rule XXII 11, and gives the received doctrine as to the mode of production of the three qualities of voice there laid down And the distinction of the four other qualities by which "soft" shades off into utter inaudibility is a later addition to the doctrine—one of those pieces of useless over-refinement which are thoroughly characteristic of the Hindu mode of working

The commentator points out that the first four of the seven *sthānas* described in this chapter are used "in sacrifices etc.," and the last three, at the morning, noon, and evening *savanas*, or somalibations, respectively And he quotes "from the Āikṣhā" a pair of verses which are found in the Rik-version of the *pāṇinīya* Āikṣhā (verses 36, 37, see Weber's Indische Studien, IV 363-4), to the effect that "in early morning, one must always read with chest-tone, resembling the growl of the tiger, at noon, with throat-tone,

9 ¹ *akṣharavyāñjanānām saśabdām upalabdhv' upabdiman' nāma caturtham vāca sthānam bhavati*⁴

¹ G M ms *ābdena sāha varitā itī saśabdām* ² W O om, B -*bāhman* ³ B om ⁴ W B O om

10 *yatro 'rasi sthāne prayoga upalabhyate tan mandram nāma vāca pañcamam' sthānam* ¹ *yatra kanthe sthāne prayoga upalabhyate tan madhyamam nāma shashtham vāca sthānam* ⁴ *yatra śirasi sthāne prayoga upalabhyate tat tārām nāma saptamam vāca sthānam* ⁵ *eteshv āditaḥ caturtham* ⁶ *'yajñādiṣhu prayogaḥ mandram* ⁷ *prātaḥsavana upayjyate* ⁸ *madhyamam madhyandine savane* ⁹ *tārām trītyasavane śikṣhā cā vām vakshyati*

like the warble of the *cakravāka*, the third soma-libation is known as accompanied with loud tone, and this is always to be employed as head-tone, with sound proceeding from the head, and resembling the cries of the peacock, *hansa* and *kokila* "

The Rik Pī (xiii 17) teaches the same three *sthānas*, but calls the third *uttama* instead of *tāra*. The Vāj Pr (i 10,30) lays down then number and then place of production (assigning to the third the *bhūmadhya*, 'middle of the brows,' instead of *śiras*, 'head'), but gives them no specific names. We cannot well avoid regarding them as involving a difference of pitch, as well as of force or loudness of utterance, the first is low, the third high and shrill, the other intermediate between them, or at the ordinary natural pitch of the voice. They answer to the lower, middle, and upper "registers" of a voice, and our modern musical theory recognizes an analogous distinction of chest-tone and head-tone. Each register, as the following rules go on to explain, is divided into seven tones or pitches.

मन्द्रादिषु त्रिषु स्थानेषु सप्तसप्त यमा ॥११॥

11 In the three qualities beginning with "soft," there are seven tones each

As synonym of *yama*, the commentator gives *svana*, doubtless here to be understood as 'musical note, tone of the gamut,' he adds 'acute, and so on,' which might be said blunderingly, as if the word he had just given meant 'accent' instead of 'musical tone,' or also intelligently, as implying the identity of accent with

*prātaḥ pathen*¹⁰ *nityam urasthitena*¹¹
*svareṇa śārdūlarutopamena*¹²
mādhyandine kuthagatena cār'va
cakādhvasamkūptasammbhena
*tāram tu vidyāt savanam*¹³ *trīṇyam*¹⁴
*śirogatam*¹⁵ *tuc ca sadā*¹⁶ *prayojyam*
mayātrahansānyabhrtasvanānām
*tulyeṇa nādena śvasthitena*¹⁷

¹ B om ² G M O put before *vacah* ³ G M ins *bhavati kante mādhyamam* ⁴ G M ins *bhavati śirasatām* ⁵ G M ins *bhavati* ⁶ B *caturvarpānām* ⁷ G M *shu 'pay* ⁸ W *nam up-* ⁹ G M *ne urasi prayu* ¹⁰ B G M om ¹¹ W *ka-* ¹² G M *than* ¹³ G M *-sthalena* ¹⁴ G M *raio-* ¹⁵ G M *-ne* ¹⁶ G M *-ye* ¹⁷ G M *-otthitam* ¹⁸ G M *tatha* ¹⁹ G M *śirogatena*

11 *trishu mandrādishu sthāneshu ekāṅkasmīn saptasapta yamā bhavanti yamāḥ 'svanāḥ udātādāya' itī yāvat saptasapte 'trī vipśāyā' ekāṅkasmīn itī labhyate ke te' yamā ity ācāṅkyo 'ttarasātreno' 'ttaram āha*

¹ G M *svarādāya* ² W B *-yāḥ*, O *yām* ³ W O *ne*, G M O put before *ke* ⁴ W *-tro*.

musical pitch—an identity which is the ground of their common appellation

The same statement, as to the seven *yāmas* or 'tones' in each *sthāna*, 'register' or 'scale,' and the same identification with the *svaras*, are made in the Rik Prāt (xiii 17) We are to assume, without much question, that the scales pass into one another by a constant ascending series, like the bass and soprano scales in our own system of musical notation

कृष्टप्रथमद्वितीयतृतीयचतुर्थमन्द्रातिस्वार्याः ॥ १२ ॥

12 Namely *krṣhta*, first, second, third, fourth, *mandra*, and *atisvārya*

These are not the ordinary names of the seven notes of the Hindu scale, or *svaras* (for which, see Jones "on the Musical Modes of the Hindus," As Res, vol iii, Weber's Indische Studien, viii 259 ff), but they are, apparently, alternative appellations for the same thing, they are given by Uvata, in his comment on Rik Prāt xiii 17, as used *sāmasu*, 'in the *sāmans*,' or 'in the Sāma-Veda' (Müller's Rik Pī, p cclxxii) Uvata calls the first *krushta*, instead of *krṣhta*, and the same is the reading of G¹ M in our rules and then commentary, as also of T in rule 14 only (Müller, l c, p cclxxiii, marginal note, states *krushta* or *kushta* to be the reading of O also, but the maker of my collation does not note the fact, except once, under rule 14, in putting in on the margin a passage inserted out of place)

तेषां दीप्तिजोपलब्धिः ॥ १३ ॥

13 Of these, the perception is born of brightness

I have simply translated the problematical word *diptyā* literally, without claiming to understand what it signifies The comment throws no light upon it, nor do I get any from any other quarter The former says merely that the perception of each preceding one is "born from the brightness" of its successor, namely, the per-

12 *krṣhtaḥ*¹ *ca*² *prathamah*³ *ca*⁴ *dvitīyah*⁵ *ca*⁶ *trītyah*⁷ *ca*⁸ *caturthah*⁹ *ca*¹⁰ *mandrah*¹¹ *ca*¹² *ṭisvāryah*¹³ *ca*¹⁴ *krṣtaprathamadvitīyatrītyacaturthamandrāṭisvāryāḥ*¹⁵ *te tathā*¹⁶ 'kṭāḥ' ¹⁷*ete khalu*¹⁸ *yamā nāma*

¹ G M *krushtaḥ* (as also in the rule) ² O om *ca* ³ O om *ca* ⁴ B O om ⁵ G M O om ⁶ B *krṣhtādayo*

13 *teshām*¹ *khalu*² *saptayamānām*³ *utturottāḥ*⁴ *adīptīyā*⁵ *pūrvapūrvopalābdhīḥ*⁶ ⁷*syāt tat*⁸ *katham*⁹ *atisvāryadīptīyā*¹⁰ *mandropalābdhīḥ*¹¹ *mandrāc*¹² *caturthopalābdhīḥ*¹³ *caturthāt*¹⁴ *trītyah*¹⁵ *trītyād*¹⁶ *dvitīyah*¹⁷ *dvitīyāt*¹⁸ *prathamah*¹⁹ *prathamāt*²⁰ *krṣhta*²¹ *upalābhyate*

¹ W *diptyopalābdhīḥ* ² G M O *saptasvarānām* ³ B *rād-*, G M *-raṇā* ⁴ O *pūrvop-* ⁵ G M om ⁶ W B *mantr-*, G M *nmudop-* ⁷ G M *krushtah*, O *krṣhtah* *ity* ⁸

ception of *mandra* from that of *atīsvārya*, that of the fourth, from *mandra*, and so on through the series. Perhaps the expression is nothing more than one violently figurative, signifying that each tone receives light from, or is set in its true light by, the rest, or the ones or one nearest it only, in that case, we should look for some word combined with *dipti* to indicate the source of the light.

Müller (under Rik Prāt xiii 17, 1 decl.) surmises that the present rule may mean the same thing with the rule of the Rik Prāt *anantaraḥ cā 'tīa yamo 'vīśeshah*, which he translates 'in these three places (*sthāna*) a *yama* without another *yama* is undistinguishable'. It is very doubtful, however, whether he is justified in rendering *anantara* by 'not having another,' and whether his rule is not rather intended to signify that the three scales pass directly into one another, the first note of the second being equivalent to an eighth of the first, and so on.

द्वितीयप्रथमकृष्टास्त्रय आह्वारकस्वराः ॥ १४ ॥

14 "Second," "first," and *kr̥ṣṭa* are the three tones of the *Āhvārakas*.

This rule makes a *śloka* with the one that follows which is, of course, a marked indication that both are interpolated here. The same thing may be inferred from the fact that rule 15 teaches nothing which is not found also in 16.

The comment adds nothing whatever to our understanding of the rule.

The *Āhvārakas* are mentioned in the Caranavyūha (paragraph 12 see Weber's Indische Studien, iii 257) as holders of one *śākhā* of the Yajur-Veda.

मन्द्रादयो द्वितीयान्ताश्चत्वारस्तैत्तिरीयकाः ॥ १५ ॥

15 The four beginning with *mandra* and ending with "second" are those of the *Tāttirīyas*.

This second half-verse, as already pointed out, is superfluous in view of the next rule, which treats the same subject, and much more explicitly.

14 *dvitīyaḥ ca prathamaḥ ca kr̥ṣṭaḥ¹ ca te tathā 'ktāḥ² ete traya āhvārakasvarāḥ³ syuh⁴ 'eshām⁵ tār eva prayogo vedītyavah⁶ 'āhvārakānām svarā⁷ āhvārakasvarāḥ*

O inserts the whole comment out of place, after that to the next rule. ¹ G M *kr̥ṣṭa* (as also, with T, in the rule), O *kush*. ² B ms *dvitīyadayaḥ*. ³ W *kasv-*, O *kārā*. ⁴ O om. ⁵ G M *te*. ⁶ B *kaśṭāsvaranam*, G M *kasvara*.

15 *mandrādayaḥ catvāro¹ dvitīyāntāḥ svarā² mandracaturthartīyadvitīyās tāttirīyakāḥ syuh³*

¹ G M O *-ra svarā*. ² G M O om. ³ O *teshām tāttirīyake prayogo vedītyavah*.

द्वितीयान्मन्द्रस्तैत्तिरीयाणां तृतीयचतुर्थावनन्तरं त-
च्चतुर्थममित्याचक्षते ॥ १६ ॥

16 According to the Tāttirīyas, the *mandra* proceeds from the "second," and the "third" and "fourth" come next after this they style the tone quaternion

The order of the four tones is not made entirely clear by this rule, nor by the commentator's explanation of it. The latter says that "the *mandra* of the Tāttirīyas is born or produced from the 'second,'" and, if the expression be used in a manner akin with those under rule 13, this would imply that the *mandra* came first, and the "second" after—which would, of course, accord best with the value of the two names *mandra* would thus be the lowest of the four *yamas*, as it is the lowest of the three *sthānas*. But the commentator then goes on to say that the series of *yamas* thus "beginning with 'second'" is styled tone-quaternion and this would imply that the order is second, *mandra*, third, fourth. Yet further, he adds that "second" is *udātta*, *mandra* is *anudātta*, and "third" and "fourth" are *svarita* and *prachaya*. This makes the impression of a purely formal and unintelligent identification, or a forcing through of a parallelism between the four tones and the four accepted accents (which, however, are in respect to tone only three, since the *prachaya* is "of *udātta* tone," xxi 10), without the slightest regard to the already defined tonic quality of the accents. The comment, in truth, through this whole subject, seems to be written with a very insufficient comprehension of the meaning of the text see especially the rules that follow.

Our attention is called to the fact that the preceding rule laid down the number of the Tāttirīya *yamas*, the present one undertaking nothing more than to describe their order, and that the intention of the last words of the rule is therefore simply to give a name to the series. I have pointed out above, however, that rules 14 and 15 seem to have been put in by themselves, without any regard to 16.

16 'tāttirīyānām dvitīyāt khaṁ mandro jāyate · tadananta-
ram' 2 trītyacaturthāu syātām 3 etad eva dvitīyādeḥ svaramanda-
lam 4 caturyamam 5 ity ācakshate yo 6 dvitīyāḥ sa udāttah 7 yo
mandrah so 'nudāttah 8 yāu trītyacaturthāu 9 tāu svarataprachayāv
'ity aṁtāḥ 10 anena sūtreṇa pūrveshām 11 eva caturām svarānām
krāmanīyamah kṛyate catuḥsamkhyā tu pūrvasūtrenā 12 'yo
'ktā tasmād atra caturyamam ity etat samjñāvidhuparam 13 it
pratīyate

(1) B om (along with all the rule save the first three words) (2) G om (3) W
B O -ādāh (4) W B ndanam (5) G M -yam (6) B dvitīyo udāttayor (7) G M
O om (8) W dvitīy (9) G M om (10) W sarv, G M O pūrvoktānām (11) O om
eva (12) W O -ānāpāramam, G M dhānap

The mention of the *Tattirīyas* here, and in this manner, seems to indicate that the *Pratigāhya* does not belong to their school, or concern itself with their *śākhā*, although, perhaps, both stand in an especially near relation to it. See what is said upon this point in the concluding note.

तस्मिन्द्विमात्रा वृत्तिः ॥ १७ ॥

17 In it, progression is by intervals of two tones

I have rendered this rule according to what seems to me most likely to be its real meaning—although, at the same time, I do not feel by any means confident that I understand it correctly. If the *Tattirīyas* acknowledge only four notes in the scale or octave, it seems natural that they should fix these at wider intervals from one another, and the phraseology of the rule is well enough calculated to express this. The verification or rejection of my version may be left till we shall better comprehend the Hindu musical system, and its modification or adaptation as here presented. I am, at any rate, persuaded that my guess is more likely to be right than either of the two which the commentator ventures. Of these, the first is nothing less than absurd. It makes *tasmin* refer to *anudatta*, although such an antecedent can only have tumbled in out of the clouds, there having been nothing whatever to suggest it in the preceding rules, and renders ‘in this *anudatta* there is a being-within of two *yamas*, that is to say, in *anudatta* inheres the quality of *svartu* and also that of *pracaya*’! And, as examples of this wonderful *anudatta*, are quoted *sā nah parshat* (not found in the *Tattirīya-Saṁhita*, but occurs *Rig-Veda* i 99 1, x 187 1-5, and *Atharva-Veda* vii 83 1), and *pāry avulātām* (i 7 2²).

The commentator’s second guess is so far better than his first that he gives the obviously correct interpretation of *tasmin*, as referring to *caturyamam* in the preceding rule, but he makes out the meaning to be that, in this series of *svaras*, two are contained in the interior, or are included between the other two. And he

17 *dvāu ca tāu yamāu ca*¹ *dvīyamāu*² *dvīyamāyor*³ *antarā-vrttir madhyavrttis*⁴ *tasmin* *anudatte* *bhavati svaritatvam* *pracayatvam* *ca* *’nudatte*⁵ *bhavati* *’ty arthah* *yuthā sa* --- *pary* ---

*kecā vnyathā kathayanti tasmin*⁶ *caturyame*⁷ *svaramandale* *dvīyamāntarā*⁸ *vrttiḥ* *svaradvayasya*⁹ *madhye vāntamānam* *syāt*¹⁰

anudatto hrā jñeyo mūrdhny udatta udāhrtah

*svaritah karnamālīyah*¹¹ *sarvāṅge*¹² *pracayah snrtah*

¹³ *asyā* *’yam arthah* ¹⁴ *udattānudattayor*¹⁵ ¹⁶ *madhye svaritapracayayor*¹⁷ *antarāvrttir bhavati* ¹⁸ *’tathā kāuhaleyahastavinyāsasamaye* *’pi*¹⁹ *svaritapracayayor antaḥ vrttir upadiṣyate*

cites a verse "anudātta is to be known as in the heart, udātta is uttered in the head, svarita is at the root of the ears (or of the throat, as G M have it), pracaya is declared to be in the whole member (or to belong to the whole mouth, W says)," the meaning of which he states to be that svarita and pracaya are found between udātta and anudātta—forgetting that under the previous rule he had assigned them a different position. Further, he says that the interior position of svarita and pracaya is shown in Kāuhaleya's system of motions of the hand, as appears from the verse "the chief of the digits (i.e. the thumb) points out udātta when its apex is applied to the root of the forefinger, when to the last but one (i.e. the ring-finger) and to the middle finger, it points out the svarita and the dhṛta, when to the little finger, the anudātta." This verse occurs in the Rik-version of the pāṇinīya Çikshā (as verse 43 see Weber's Indische Studien, iv 365) the commentator does not regard it as a Çikshā verse, but adds yet another which he claims to take from his Çikshā, although it is not found in either version of the known treatise of that name (but compare verse 44, l c, p 366) "the little finger, the ring-finger, the middle finger, and the forefinger—these, along with the tip of the thumb, severally point out the grave, circumflex, dhṛta, and acute accents." The pracaya is here twice called dhṛta, and it again, apparently, receives the same name in the last rule of the chapter (unfortunately, I overlooked these passages when commenting on the term dhṛtapracaya in rule xviii 3) "sustained" or "continued" is a sufficiently natural substitute for pracaya, as appellation of the accent in question.

I do not understand precisely what and how much credit the commentator intends to claim for these two explanations in calling them (in his final remark) mukhya if he means that they are the best among a number which had been suggested and might have been reported, it is so much the worse for the rest.

¹⁷udāttam ākhyāti vrsho 'ṅgulīnām
pradeśinīmūlanvīṣtamārdhā
upāntunadhye¹⁸ svaritam dhṛtam ca
kanishthikāyām anudāttam eve .

¹⁹çikshāvacanam upi¹⁹ cāi 'vam vakshyati
kanishthikā²⁰ 'nāmikā ca²¹ madhyamā ca pradeśinī
nīcasvāradhṛtodāttān āṅguṣṭhāgrenā²² nīrdṛṣet
mukhyam eva²³ vyākhyānadvayam²⁴ etat

¹ MSS om ² W O om ³ W B O mor ⁴ G M om, B madhyev, O madhyev ⁽⁵⁾ O om ⁶ G M -mī ⁷ W B O ma ⁸ W B O dvitry- ⁹ G M -dvayamasya ¹⁰ G M O ins tāthā hī ¹¹ G M kantham- ¹² W sarvāsyah, O sarvāsyē ⁽¹³⁾ W om, B om asya ¹⁴ G M udāttānūddāttasvarita ⁽¹⁵⁾ W om ⁽¹⁶⁾ O om, G M -leṣe hast- ⁽¹⁷⁾ O om, G M ākhyāti yathā pradeśinīmūla udāttam upāntamadhyaṅgor madhye svaritam ca kanishthikāyām anudāttam it ¹⁸ W atecam- ⁽¹⁹⁾ O çikshā ²⁰ O śthā ²¹ G M ca 'pi, O cā 'tha ²² O ān-
guṣṭhāyena ²³ G M evam ²⁴ W O -nam dv-

तामुपदेक्ष्यामः ॥ १८ ॥

18 That progression we will set forth

The commentator declares *tām* here to bring forward solely the word *vr̥ttim* from the preceding rule (not that word with its qualifications), and the *vr̥tti* aimed at to be the fourfold progression of the *caturyana* taught in rules 16 and 19. This is, of course, forced and unacceptable. I imagine that, on the contrary, in the oral tradition of the *Prātīcakhya*, an uttered illustration of the four tones, separated by double intervals and so covering the whole octave, was given—which illustration, of course, could not be set down in the written text.

तच्चतुर्यममित्युक्तम् ॥ १९ ॥

19 That is what is called the quaternion of tones

This is naturally enough explainable as a winding-up remark, after the exemplification of the four *Tatturiya* tones notified in the preceding rule has been duly given. To the commentator, it is a mere repetition of what had been already stated above, in rules 15 and 16, and he excuses it as being intended, under the guise of a summing-up, to confirm the view laid down, and repel other opinions inconsistent with it. For, he adds, some people hold the doctrine that there are three *svaras* only, as appears from the half-verse "acute, grave, and circumflex are the three accents." This verse (from the *pāṇinīya* *Chikshā*) was quoted in full above, under rule xxi 1, and W adds the second half of it here also.

The futility of this exposition, as well as of much that precedes it, will, I think, be obvious to any one. Instead of tracing and pointing out the relation which actually exists between the accents and the *yamas*, and letting us see what musical intervals are re-

18 *yad etad dāryāṣṣ caturyamam ity uktam tasya caturbhedābhinnā¹ vr̥ttir² nāma tām upadekshyāma ity ucyate³ tām itī tachabhedena⁴ pūrvoktavrttimātram anukrshyate⁵*

¹ G M *ām* ² G M *im* ³ W O *tānimuttāṣaḍā*, B *tām itī labdhena* ⁴ W *-kathya-*

19 *ity unena prakāreṇa caturyamam ity¹ uktam yady api man drādayo dvitīyāntā (xxiii 15) ityādisūtradvayena yamacatushtayatvam² siddham tathā 'py upasamhāramishena³ matāntaranvr̥ttiyartham⁴ drdhayati yatah karanād evam anye manyante svaratrayamātram*

udāttaṣ ca¹ 'nūdāttaṣ ca svarataṣ² ca³ 'svarāṣ trayah⁴

'hrasvo dīrghah pluta itī kālato nīyamā aci⁵

¹ O *om* ² W *caturyamamacatushtayam pra*, B *tayam na*, O *cat-* ³ W *-shtena*, G M *hārena m-* ⁴ G M *ms imam artham* ⁵ B O *-ya itī*, G M *trayasvarā itī manyante* ⁶ in W only

garded as separating the different accentual pitches from one another, the commentator simply confuses the two together, and regards as said of the one what has reference only to the other

क्रमिवक्रमसंपन्नामदुतामविलम्बिताम् ।

नीचोच्चस्वारसंपन्नां वदेद्वतवतीः समां

वदेद्वतवतीः समामिति ॥ २० ॥

20 It must be uttered with *krama* and *vikrama*, not hurried, not delayed, with grave, acute, and circumflex accent, with *pracaya*, and even

The commentator supplies *vr̥ttim* as the subject of all these attributes, accounting for it as derived from rule 17, above. This is hardly admissible, but what is to be understood instead is doubtful, depending upon the connection in which this verse may have stood in the text from which it was taken. The same connection would perhaps explain what *krama* and *vikrama* are to be regarded as meaning: the commentator defines *krama* by *dvitva*, 'duplication' (taught in chapter xiv), and *vikrama* as the accent of that name prescribed at xix 1,2, but it seems very unlikely that two things so dissimilar would be thus combined, or that a detail of accent would not be put in the second line, with the rest of its kind (compare rule xxiv 6, where *krama* and *vikrama* are found again in conjunction). *Dhṛta* is defined as synonymous with *pracaya*: compare the note to rule 17, above. *Samām* means, we are told, 'free from the faults of deficiency and excess in the matter of *udātta* and the other accents'.

There are slight variations of reading in the rule, T giving *adhṛtām* in *pāda* b, B *svara* for *svāra* in c, W G M having *vade* for *vaded*, and W *drutavatiḥ* and T *dratav-* after it, but they are mere errors of scribes, as the comment plainly shows.

20 tāttvīyāhvdrakamatanirūpakō¹ 'yam glosah kramavikramābhyaṁ² sanpannām kramo nāma³ dvitvam⁴ vikramas tu svaritayor madhye yatra nicam⁵ (xix 1) ityuktalikshanah adṛtām atvaritām avilambitām amandām nicoccasvdrasampannām anuddāttodāttasvaritasahitām⁶ dhṛtavatīm pracayavatīm samām udāttādibhir nyūnātirekāśadosharahitām⁷ vaded brūyāt⁸ vr̥ttim⁹ ity arthah vr̥ttim iti katham lubhyate tasmīn dviyam āntarā vr̥ttir¹⁰ (xxiii 17) itiprahrtatvād¹¹ iti brāmah

iti tribhāṣhyaratne prātibhāyavivaranē

trayaviṅś¹² dhyāyah

¹ W B -akam etan nir, O rakamatan nir ² W -vikrama ³ G M O om ⁴ G M dvitvaparyāyah ⁵ O -cañ syād ⁶ B -ritapracayasamh ⁷ B nyūnātirek-
tādh-, O nyūnātirek- ⁸ G M ins vmdm ⁹ B om ¹⁰ O v ¹¹ O -krtatv ¹² G
M O dvitvayaprañe ekādāṣo

CHAPTER XXIV

CONTENTS 1-4, the four *samhitās* or texts, 5-6, qualifications of a Veda reader and teacher

अथ चतस्रः संहिताः ॥ १ ॥

1 Now for the four texts

A simple heading to the following rules

पदसंहिताक्षरसंहिता वर्णसंहिताङ्गसंहिता चे-
ति ॥ २ ॥

2 Word-text, syllable text, letter text, and member-text, namely

Here is a very curious and problematical enumeration and designation of *samhitās*. The commentator divides up among them the teachings of the Pratiśākhya. To the "word-text" he assigns chapters v-ix, xi, xii, and xiii 1-4—that is to say, the great body of rules for the combination of *pada*-text into *samhitā*. To the "syllable-text" he assigns chapter x, which has to do chiefly with such euphonic combinations of vowels as make one syllable out of two. With the "letter-text" are concerned chapters xiii (1 except rules 1-4), xiv, and xvi, mainly occupied with the subjects of duplication and of the occurrence in the Saṁhitā of *n* and *ñ*, otherwise than as these are results of the rules of euphonic combination. And the "member-text" is said to be taught in chapter

1 *athe 'ity ayaṁ adhikāraḥ catasrah samhitā¹ ucyanta² ity etad adhikṛtaṁ vedhavyam ita uttaram yaḥ vakshyāmaḥ³*

¹ G M ins *ity* ² O om ³ O *yate*

2 *padāksaravarṇāṅgaśrayāḥ¹ catasrah samhitāḥ kramena boddhavyāḥ pañcamādhyāyam² ārabhyā³ navamād ekādaśa-dvādaśā⁴ trayodaśasyā⁵ dāu sūtracaturstayam ca padasamhitā daśamo 'kṣaṇasamhitā trayodaśacaturdaśā⁶ shodaśaś ca var-nasamhitā⁷ vyañjanaṇ svarāṅgam (xxi 1) ity eśā⁸ āga-samhitā etā⁹ catasrah samhitāḥ eteśv anyatra¹⁰ vikṛtam ni-shēddham¹¹ ca kāryam sarvasamhitāsu¹² kuryāt¹³ yatrā¹⁴ rsha-grahanādiko viśeṣo nā 'sti¹⁵*

¹ W -gā ayāḥ, O -gāyāḥ ² W B O ārabhya a nav-, G M ārabhya unapa-dāśādaśa, W O dvādaśa ³ O śā ⁴ W rdaśa ⁵ B G M ekavīṅṣo ⁶ G M om ⁷ O ins ca ⁸ G M nishādhyaṅgaṇ ⁹ B ta, G M sarvatra saṁh, O sahit- ¹⁰ G M syāt ¹¹ W B O atrā ¹² G M add tatra kuryat

xxi (rules 1-9), which prescribes of what vowel each consonant shall be regarded as "member" or adjunct, or lays down the rules of syllabication. And it is added that whatever is prescribed or forbidden elsewhere than in [the rules belonging to each of] these is of force in all the different texts, unless there be some special restriction, as by the use of the word *anśha* (ix 21, x 13) or the like.

It is unnecessary to point out that the Prāṭīkāḥya contemplates no such division of its rules and restriction of their application as is here made, and that, unless the distinction of texts laid down in the rule means something different from what the commentator explains it to be, it is trivial and worthless.

नानापदसंधानसंयोगः पदसंक्षितेत्यभिधीयते ॥ ३ ॥

3 Conjunction of independent words by euphonic combination is called word-text.

The commentator first explains *samdhāna* as modifying *saṃyoga* in quality of a locative, and then declares the use of the two equivalent terms to be for the purpose of signifying the exceeding closeness of the combination (if, as I presume to be the case, the reading of B is here the correct one). And he quotes the rule of Pāṇini (1.4.109) as what "the grammarians" say upon the subject, giving the definition of *samhitā* or combined text. As example of word-text, he gives *agne dūdha gahya kiṃṣiḥ vanya yā tu iśuh* (v 5.9¹, only G. M. have *iśuh*).

This interpretation makes *padasamhitā* signify what we are wont to call *samhitā* simply, in distinction from *padapāṭha*, or *padasamhitā* as usually employed, 'pada-text'.

यथास्वमन्त्रसंक्षितादीनामप्येवम् ॥ ४ ॥

4 And in like manner with the syllable text and the rest, in accordance with their several names.

The commentator explains *yathāsvam* as signifying 'it goes on without exceeding that which is its own,' and pronounces it a 'distinction of office or use,' thus, namely, the peculiar form of all the other specified texts is to be determined, the combination of inde-

3 *nānābhūṭayoh padayoh samdhāne yah saṃyogah sa padu-samhite 'ty abhādhiyata ucayata ity arthah yathā' agne.... ekārthayoh samdhānasamnyogapadūyoh¹ prayogah samūhānādhi-kyārthah² tathā ca vāryākaranāḥ³ pathanti⁴ paraḥ samnikar-śah samhite 'ti*

¹ G. M. -yogayoh, O. saṃyogesaṃbadhānaḥ. ² W. nādīkyādityarthah, G. M. sambandhīkārthah, O. sambandhīkādīkārthah. ³ G. M. O. nā. ⁴ G. M. dhānanti, O. api.

4. *svamsvam¹ anatikramya vartata itī yathāsvam kriyāvi-śeṣaṇam² eva³ tat⁴. evam akṣarasamhitādīnāṃ api yathāsvam⁵*

pendent syllables is syllable-text—and so on. And he quotes three passages from the text, by way of illustration *athā 'bravīt* (m 2 11³), *adhishuvanam asī* (1 1 5²), and *akṣnayā vyāghārayati* (v 2 7⁵ et al). Of these, the first is an example of the combination of two separate syllables (vowels) into one syllable, by a rule (2) of the tenth chapter, the second, of the occurrence of *n* after *sh*, by rule xii 6, 7, the third offers (like almost any other pair of words in the *Samhitā*) cases of the division of consonant-groups, *akṣhst-tna-yāv-vyā* etc. Or, by a different treatment of the successive distinctions, it is said that the combination of two vowels alone is "syllable-text," that of a vowel and consonant in one word is "letter-text," that of consonants alone in one word (consonants being "members" or adjuncts of vowels, xxi 1) is "member-text," anything else than these is "word-text."

It appears from all this that *samhitā* is here used nearly in the sense of *saṁdhi*, 'euphonic combination,' and that these four rules have no significance whatever, being a mere bit of outside classification, in which some one has amused himself by indulging

गुरुत्वं लघुता साम्यः रुस्वदीर्घप्लुतानि च ।
लोपागमविकाराश्च प्रकृतिर्विक्रमः क्रमः ॥
स्वरितोदात्तनीचवः श्वासो नादो ऽङ्गमेव च ।
एतत्सर्वं तु विज्ञेयं हन्द्भाषामधीयता ॥ ५ ॥

5 Heaviness, lightness, evenness, short, long, and protracted quantity, elision, increment, and euphonic alteration, natural state, *vikrama*, *krama*, circumflex, acute, and grave quality, breath, tone, and adjunction—all this must be understood by him who reads the Veda language

svarūpam nirūpanīyam nānākṣharasamyogo 'kṣharasamhitā 'nānāvarnasamyogo varnasamhitā nānāṅgasamyogo 'ṅgasamhitā 'krameno 'dāharanāni bhānāmah' yuthā' athā--- adhī--- akṣh--- kevalasvarayoh samyogo 'kṣharasamhitā 'ekapade svaravyaṅjanasamyogo varnasamhitā ekapade kevalavyaṅjanasamyogo 'ṅgasamhitā ' anyatra padasamhitā ity avānturabhedo vyñeayah

¹ W B *vam* ² G M om, O om *eva* ³ O *sva* ⁴ G M put also after rule 4 in the text of the Prāṇīkhyā, as if rules 5 and 6 ⁵ O om ⁶ W om, G M *vyāharāmah* ⁷ G M om ⁸ B om

5 *yad gurutvādīṣṭādaṇḍāpavidhau etat sarvaṁ chandobhāshām vedarūpām' vācam adhīyatā pathatā vyñeyam aha vā chandobhāshām' vedulakṣhanam' ity arthah tuṣabdo 'dhyetravya-turīkṣhedhārthah' anena' tu sarvathā vyñeyam ity arthah*

The commentator explains *vedabhāṣhām* as meaning either 'voice having the form of Veda,' i.e. the uttered material of the Veda, or (according to another sense of *bhāṣhā*) 'explanation of the Veda.' The particle *tu* in the last half-verse (which I have omitted in translating, as being a mere expletive or *pādapāna*), he states to mean that the reader referred to must by all means understand all this, but not any one besides. And he adds at the end that *vyñeaya* indicates the peremptoriness of the rule, there being risk of harm in the absence of the required knowledge, as is shown by the verse "a *mantra* deficient in respect to accent or to letters" etc. This is the familiar verse, found in the *pāṇinīya* *Çikshā* (verse 52 see Weber's *Indische Studien*, iv 367-8), and quoted times innumerable in Hindu works, where the present subject is under consideration. O alone adds the second *pāda*, "being falsely applied, does not express the intended sense," the rest is, "it, an uttered thunderbolt, harms the sacrificer, like the word *indragatru* [when used by Tvashtar] with false accent."

The rest of the comment is occupied with illustration of the points referred to in the rule, along with now and then a few words of explanation. For "heavy" quality (see xxi 14) is cited *vashat svāhā* (vii 3 12), for "light" (see xxi 15), *akuruta* (v 5 8¹ et al. W B give instead *akurvata* [i 7 3² et al.], which is less acceptable, as containing also a heavy syllable). *Sāmīya*, 'evenness, sameness,' is defined as implying that, of two elements compared, there is—in respect to place and organ of articulation, quantity, etc.—sameness (so G M, but B O read 'bigness' instead, and W has 'steadiness') what is really meant, is obscure, we may compare the use of the adjective *sama* in xviii 20. The examples for short, long, and protracted, respectively, are *gamayati* (i 7 3⁴ et al.), *vāyāv evā'sya* (vi 3 7⁴), and *astu hīs iti* (vii 1 6¹ G M omit *iti*). Elision is instanced by *im'andrasu* (iv 1 8² see above, v 12), increment, by *trapuṣ ca me* (iv 7 5¹ see above, v 4), euphonic conversion, by *sam indra no manasā* (i 4 44¹ only O has *manāsa* a case under vii 2). To illustrate *prakṛti*, 'original condition,' are given three phrases, *agne dūdhrā gahya kiñcila vanya yā te* (v 5 9¹ W B end with *kiñcila*, and G M with *vanya*, and G M O omit *agne*), *prapā asī* (ii 5 12⁴), and *na mi-*

gurutvam yathā vashat.... *lūghutā yathā akuruta sām-*
īyam yathā. *sthānakaranakālādibhiḥ*⁸ *anyor asti sthānīyam*⁹ *iti.*
*hrasvādīrghaphūṭāni ca*⁸ *yathā gamayati vāyāv*.... *astu*
.... *lopo yathā*⁹ *im*.... *āgamo yathā trapuṣ*....¹⁰ *vi-*
kāro yathā sam.... *prakṛtir yathā. agne*.... *prapā*....
na....¹⁰ *vikramo yathā vodhave kramo nāma dvitvam*¹¹
yathā yad....¹² *yad*....¹² *svaritodāttanīcānām bhāvah svar-*
*todāttanīcatvam*¹³ *tad yathākrannam*¹³ *nirūpyate*¹⁴ *nyañcam.*
gām.... *avudātām vivṛte svāsu* (ii 5) *ity uktah*¹⁵ *svāso*
yathā pā.... *samvṛte*¹⁶ *kunthe nādah kriyatu* (ii 4) *ity*

tham abhavan (v 3 6² G M omit *na*) Of these, the second is a case under x 13, the third, under x 18 both exhibiting a vowel which irregularly remains *prahrtyā*, or exempt from alteration. But the particular bearing of the first example on the point of *prahrty* is more obscure: the phrase is one in which the *samhata*-reading is (except in respect to accent) the same with the *pada*, and this, probably, is the reason why it is taken. Compare the comment and note to v 2, where this part of the rule now in hand is quoted. For *vikrama* is given the word *vādhavē* (1 6 2¹ et al), of which the second syllable has the accent called *vikrama*, by xix 1. *Krama* is again (as under xiii 20) defined as 'duplication,' and a phrase is quoted containing a case that calls for duplicated utterance, *yad vā hotā* (iii 2 9¹ 1 e *yad dvā*, by xiv 1). O adds another of like character, *yad venoh* (v 1 1⁴). We are permitted to doubt, however, here as at xxiii 20, whether these terms were intended by the maker of the rule in the sense which the commentator assigns to them. The three accents are instanced, in their order as mentioned, by *nyāñcam* (v 5 3²), *gā'm vā'vā tātū tāt* (1.7 2²), and *avadañam* (1.7 2²). Reference is made to rule ii 5 as defining "breath," and as example of breath-sounds, or *sud* consonants, is cited *pāshā te* (1.1 2²). B has instead *pāte*, and W *purte*, which occurs at iv 7 13⁵). Rule ii 4, again, is referred to as defining "tone" or sonant utterance, and the example is *bhāgadhe bhāgadhāh* (ii 5 6⁶). Finally, *anḡam*, which I have rendered 'adjunction,' is interpreted as alluding to the subject of syllabication (xix 1 etc.), and a phrase is quoted, *tam matsyah prā'bravīt* (ii 6 6¹), which we are to divide *tam-mat-syah-prāb* *bravīt*.

The verses composing this rule are found in a passage prefixed to the proper text of the Rik Prāt (see Müller's edition, p viii)

पदक्रमविशेषज्ञो वर्णक्रमविचक्षणः ।

स्वरमात्राविभागज्ञो गृहेदाचार्यसंस्तदं

गृहेदाचार्यसंस्तदमिति ॥ ६ ॥

6 He who understands the distinctions of the *pada krama*, who is versed in the *varṇa krama*, and knows the divisions of accent and quantity, may go and sit with the teachers

ukto nādo yathā bhāḡ-... vyañjanañ svarānḡam (xii 1) *ity uktam anḡam yathā tam-... vyñeyutvam*¹⁷ *iti*¹⁸ *nitya-vidhāh vipakshe bādhat manto hīnah svarato varnato ve*¹⁹ *'tyādā*²⁰

¹ G M *dasvar* ² O *śā* ³ W O *nat*, G M *nam* ⁴ W *ita it nsh*
⁵ G M *anenā'āhyata* ⁶ G M *sthanakā* ⁷ B O *sthanayam*, G M *ti samyam*
⁸ G M O om ⁹ W *inḡ etat sar nam tu vyñeyam chandobhavadhāyata* ⁽¹⁰⁾ B om
¹¹ G M *ins tad* ⁽¹²⁾ in O only ⁽¹³⁾ W *padat* O *tad yathu* ¹⁴ O om ¹⁵ MSS
tam ¹⁶ W om ¹⁷ G M O *-yam* ¹⁸ G M *ita* ¹⁹ O *va* ²⁰ W *dnā*, B *dna*
nama, O *māthyā prayukto nḡ tam anḡam dha vyadnam*

This verse also is prefixed to the Rik Piāt (Müller, p viii)

The commentator gives a merely mechanical explanation of the two terms composing the first half-verse, without telling us what he understands them really to mean. Doubtless the *pada-krama* is that which is commonly known as the "*krama-text*," and for the construction of which the other Piātūākhyas (Rik Pi x, xi, Vāj Pr iv 179-194, Ath Pi iv 101-126) give full directions, and the *varṇa-krama* is the text with duplicated consonants, according to the rules of our fourteenth chapter. The compound *svaramātrāvibhāga* we are taught to treat as a dependent one, we might also be tempted to regard it as copulative, and to understand *vi-bhāga* in the sense of 'separation' (as in *padu-text* etc.), as in the only other place where it occurs in the treatise (iii 1) "Going to the assembly of teachers" is interpreted to signify not merely the sitting with them on earth, but the enjoyment with them of the abode of felicity, the *brahmaloka*—it being explained (except in G M) that "the teachers" are Vyāsa and his like. Then, *apropos* of this promise of heaven to those versed in the class of subjects of which the Piātūākhya treats, the commentator proceeds to quote from various *purāṇas* and kindred works the praises and promises there given to those who teach the Veda.

Thus, from the Gauda-purāṇa "Of all kinds of knowledge, that of the Veda is called highest, hence, he who communicates that wins heaven and final beatitude. As chief of all sciences has been produced the *brahmu-science*, hence, he who is devoted to giving it will receive the whole recompense of giving." From the Devī-purāṇa "To those twice born, the Veda is the chief means

6 'padānām kramah padakramah' tasya viśeshah tam jānāti 'ti padakramaviśeshagñāh varṇānām kramo varṇakramah'.
tasmān vicakṣhaṇo nripuno varṇakramavicakṣhaṇah' svarāḥ ca
'mātrāḥ ca' svaramātrāḥ tāsām vibhāgaḥ tam jānāti 'ti svaramātrāvibhāgagñāh' mātrāḥ abdena kālaviśeshah kaścīd ucyate.
so 'pi caturānur' ityādiśhu' evānvidhah puruṣa ācāryasamīdum
'gachet 'ācāryā' vyāsādāryah' teshām 'brahmaloke'
sthānam 'yag ce 'dum' pāstram jānate so 'pi ācāryatvāt teshām sadṛśam' brahmalokam gachati.¹⁷

tathā ca' paurāṇikā bhānanti' gāruḍapurdne'
āhuh samastavidyānām vedavidyām anuttamām'.
atas taddātūr asty eva lābhah svargāpavargayoh
vidyānām paramā' vidyā brahmanvidyā' samīritā.
atas 'taddānaḥ gīlaḥ ca' survan' dānuphalam labhet'
devīpurāṇe²⁷

veda eva dvayātīnām sphāhanam 'yag saḥ phalam'.
ato' svādhyayanābhyaśati' puram brahmā 'dhigachati.
'tam eva gīlayet prājñāh gñehyebhyas ta m pradāpayet
tadabhyāśapradānābhyaśam 'etat kim na' 'dhigachati'²¹

of obtaining good things, hence, by application to the reading of the Veda one attains the highest *brahma*. To that let him who is wise especially devote himself, that let him deliver over to pupils, by application to that and communication of it what is there that one does not attain?" From Yājñavalkya "Above all sacrifices, and ascetic practices, and pure works, the Veda is the highest means of felicity to the twice-born ones. The Brahman who, not reading the Vedas, expends his labor in other directions—he quickly falls, while living, into the condition of a *Çūdra*, and his posterity with him" (the latter of these two verses, which is not given by W. B., is found in Manu, at ii 168). From the Mahābhārata "Whoever shall repeat to pupils the religious, sacred Sarasvatī, he shall gain a reward equal to that from the giving of land and kine." From the Vishnubharmottara purāna "By imparting the Veda, a man attains all the fruits of sacrifices, by imparting an *upadeśa*, he shares in the bliss of the Gandharvas." From the Brahmapurāna "That reward cannot be told in a thousand æons, which, oh sage! one obtains by even a very little teaching of the Veda." And from the Bhavishyat-purāna "The sonless obtains sons, the poor becomes rich, but he who is ever devoted to the study of the Veda is dissolved in the highest *brahma*."

Next we are told the characteristic form of the Veda. "The Yajur-Veda is brown-eyed, slim-waisted, big-throated, big-checked, black-footed, dusky, born of the family of Kaśyapa." If there is (as may be the case) real meaning hidden under these apparently senseless epithets, it escapes my discovery.

tathā ca yājñavalkyah

yajñānām tapasām cā 'va gubhānām³³ cā 'va kurmanām
veda eva dvayātīnām nihyreyasukarah parah

"yo 'nadhītya³⁶ dvijo vedān anyatra kurute gramam
sa jīnam eva śūdratvam āyu gachati sāvayah³⁴
mahābhārata³⁵

yo brūyāt cā 'pi śishyebhyo³⁷ dharmyām brāhminī sarasvatīm
prthivīgoppradānubhyām su tilyaphalam agnau
vishnubharmottare 'pi³⁸

vedadānād avāpnoti suvām yajñaphalam narah
upavedapradānena gandharvāḥ saha modate
brahmapurāne 'pi³⁹

na tat⁴⁰ kalpasahasrenu gūḍitum⁴¹ śakyate phalam
yad vedadānād āpnoti⁴² valpād⁴³ api mahāmate
bhavishyatpūāne 'pi⁴⁴

aputro labhate putrān adhanā dhanavān bhavet
saddādhyayanayuktas tu⁴⁵ 'pare brahmani⁴⁶ tiyate
vedasvarūpam ucyate

yajurveduḥ pīṅgalākṣaḥ kṛṣṇamādhyo brhadgalaḥ
brhatkapolāḥ kṛṣṇānāghrīḥ⁴⁷ tāmraḥ kaśyapagotrājāḥ⁴⁸

Once more, the *vedāṅgas* and *upāṅgas* are rehearsed—the former, in the usual number and with the usual names—the latter, as *anupada*, *ānupada* (?), *chandobhāshā*, *mīmāṃsā*, *nyāya*, and *tarka*—the first two of these last are elsewhere called *pratipada* and *anupada* (see Weber's *Indische Studien*, iii 260–261, and the *St. Petersburg Lexicon*)

With this, in W B, the *Tribhāshyaratna* ends, but G M O have an added passage, the bearing of which is not in all points quite clear to me. It begins with stating that he who reads the Veda thus accompanied by the *āṅgas* and *upāṅgas*, and with knowledge of the characteristic form and family, becomes purified. A verse then follows, in which it appears to be laid down how far the rules of the *Prātīkhyā* have force—namely, as regards other texts, and passages which are not the subject of *sātras* and are of human authorship (?). By way of illustration, nine passages are quoted, not one of which is to be found in the *Sanhita* proper, although five are from its endings of sections, or the summaries of words with which the divisions of sections (half-centuries, *kandikās*) conclude—they are *pra nuktatī āya devyāya* (G M omits *devyāya*, and O begins *anuksh-*), *su in manāda mahi karma kartave* (O omits *karma*—*Tāttvīya-Brahmana* ii 5 8⁹, *Rig-Veda* ii 22 1), *ma-hi-suptuduceṇā vasyuvātāh* (from the ending of iv 4 12), *api-sida-mithuni ashtāu ca* (from the ending of vi 5 8), and *asmins-tanuvu-stu-hi-pindakam* (from the ending to iv 5 10)—in these the rules are said not to hold good, and *sinhe vyāghra uta ya pradakāni* (*Tāttvīya-Brahmana* ii 7 7¹, *Atharva-Veda* vi 38 1, *Kāthaka* xxvi 15), *dvādaçā gnishtomasya stotrāni* (O *stotranī*), *ātmanāpura-nish-pra-gukraçocishā* (from the ending of vi 4 10—G M stops at *pra*), and *uçmañi-po-sham ekānnavinçatiç ca* (ending of i 3 6—G M stop at *posham*), in which the rules are said to hold good. So much as this, now, seems clear—that the first two quotations in each class are given as coming from some other Vedic text than the *Tāttvīya-*

vedāṅgāny ucyante

*çakshā kalpo vyākharanam nuktam jyotiṣham tathā
chandasaṁ¹⁸ lakshanam ce 'ti śhaḍ ānyāni viduḥ budhāḥ¹⁹
anupadaṁ²⁰ cā²¹ "nupadaṁ chandobhāshāsamānvitam
mīmāṃsānyāyatarkam²² ca upāṅgāni viduḥ budhāḥ²³
"evam sāmīyopāṅgavedasya lakshanam sampādānam²⁴*

*iti tribhāshyaratne prātīkhyāvarṇane
çaturvingo²⁵ 'dhyāyah
iti dvitīyapragñah samāptah*

(1) G M om (2) W B om (3) W B om (4) O om (5) O om (6) O sá (7) W caran, O nuka (8) G M ity avadishma, O ity dvādashma (9) O ins sthānam (10) G M samsadām sthānam ācāryayya samsadām (11) W B O ryaḥ (12) O ins ca (13) W -kam, G M ko hi (14) B padu (15) B om (16) G M sadanam, O samsadām sthāna (17) O gachet (18) W om (19) W B bhūnanti, O vadanti (20) B gar-, G M de p (21) W B mam (22) G M ca parā (23) W om (24) G M O nato rājan (25) B G M rva (26) W B bhavet, O bhēt (27) O tathā ca dev

Sanhita (I should guess that they would all prove to occur in the Brāhmana or Āraṇyaka), and that the first class are offered as containing cases of combination at variance with the rules of the Pratiçākhyā, while in the second class these rules are observed throughout. Thus, in the first example, vii 4 would require *naksh-* after *ma*, in the second, vi 12 would require *im 'amāda*, in the third, the *s* of *saṁpta* should be *sh* by vi 2, in the fourth, the *i* of *mithunī* should remain unchanged by x 18, in the fifth, *asmin* is not included among the words which by vi 14 have an increment of *s* before *t*. In the other class, on the contrary, *agnishtomasya* follows vi 2, *nish ma* is by viii 24 and 35 (see the comment to viii 35, where the passage is quoted as illustration), and *uḁmasī* by iii 13, the first example has nothing but cases under the general laws of euphony. I conjecture, then, that the *na* in the second line of the introductory verse is to be amended to *ca*, and that we are instructed that the rules of the treatise are followed, outside the Sanhita proper, only according to the nature of each particular case, or even by arbitrary choice. If there is any definite system according to which the phonetic peculiarities of the Sanhita are observed or neglected in putting together the endings of sections and other divisions, I, at any rate, have not been at the pains to study it out, and the work belongs rather to an editor of the Sanhita than to an editor of the Pratiçākhyā. It seems somewhat strange to find the prolonged *i* of *uḁmasī* retained in the ending, while the uncombinable character of the final of *mithunī* is neglected.

There can be little question that the passage here treated is an appendage to the proper text of the Tribhāshyaratna, which, with the Pratiçākhyā, takes in general (the only exception is at viii 35) no account of the subdivisions of *anuvākas*.

By way of conclusion, the remark is added that the repetition of the final words of the rule indicates the end of the treatise. This is not to be approved, for the repetition is simply that which is made at the end of every chapter, and so shows nothing more than the conclusion of the chapter.

(26) W *yasasah ph*, G M *preyasam param*, O *preyasah param*. ²⁹ G M O *tato*
³⁰ G M -*dhyanyaniratat* (31) W B om (32) O *tat hi yagña* ³³ O *śucnam* (34) W
 B om ³⁵ O *nailhiva* ³⁶ G M O *te 'pi* ³⁷ G M *śishyāya* ³⁸ G M O om
³⁹ G M O om ⁴⁰ W O *tulya* ⁴¹ O *gami-* ⁴² W B *avap-* ⁴³ W O *svātmad*
⁴⁴ G M O om (45) O *parabrahman* ⁴⁶ W -*nādhrik*, O *śhanundhe* ⁴⁷ G
 M *kāç-* ⁴⁸ W -*lānse* ⁴⁹ W -*dhañ* ⁵⁰ O *prad* ⁵¹ G M *na* ⁵² W B O -*rkaç*
⁵³ W -*dhañ* (54) B *sāngopāṅgavedasvalakshanam*, and put below, after *varane*,
 (55) M O substitute *enam sāngopāṅgam vedam gotasvarupadhyanena* (G M -*di*
vyānam) *adhyanah pulo bhavati* [yadrachaya
granthāntare yathatattvam (O *yathā tadvad*) *idam śāstram* (G M *ms yathāvadhi*)
asūtriteshu (O *nīcāteshu*) *sthāneshu parurusheshu na* (O om) *variate*
tathā hi pra- *so-* *mahr-* *api-* *asmins-* *ityādau na* (O
 om *na*) *variate* (G *prav*) *sinhe-* *dūd-* *ātm-* *u-* *masi-*
ityādau tu variate *gachēd ācāryasamsadam it vīpsā çāstī osamāptini* (O -*trapa-*
sam) *dyotayati* ⁵⁶ B *nçatmo*, G M O *dvitryapragne dvādaço*

CONCLUDING NOTE

It seems desirable to present here, at the end of the work, a discussion and exposition of certain points which could not be connectedly or fully treated in the notes upon the rules.

A first important question is that of the relation of the Prātisākhya to the known text of the Black Yajur-Veda, or to the Taittirīya-Saṁhitā.

In considering this question, it is impossible to separate entirely the Prātisākhya itself from its commentary. The former does not quote passages in its rules, but defines situations or specifies words, singly or in combination. Sometimes, indeed, either of these virtually amounts to the citation of a passage, but, in the great majority of cases, only the commentator can inform us what are the passages had in view. For example, we may regard *eshtah* (viii 18) as in effect a reference to 12 11¹ and vi 2 2⁶, but the words cited in viii 8 (as *abibhar*, *akar*, *punar*, *pitār*) are indefinite in their indications, and it would be impossible to say that any given passage in the Saṁhitā in which one of these words occurs, either was or was not contemplated by the makers of the rule. I shall therefore present in connection with one another the evidence derivable from the text itself and that from the comment.

There are four words or parts of words specified in the Prātisākhya-text which are not to be found in the Taittirīya-Saṁhitā: they are *stanutar* (viii 8), *carshan* (xiii 13), *jīgvā* (xvi 13), and *jighāsi* (xvi 18). It is very remarkable, however, that each of these is a kind of reflex or varied repetition of another word preceding it in the same rule: thus, we have *sanuta* *stanutah*, *carman* *carshan*, *jīgvā* *jīgvā*, and *jighāsi* *jighāsi*. And this, taken in connection with the fact that all of them appear to be in themselves un genuine, never having been found, so far as I am aware, in any Vedic text, and being, at least in part, impossible or highly implausible forms, is sufficient to stamp them as probable corruptions, blundering intrusions into the Prātisākhya, and of no force to prove that the latter was made for a text that contained them.

The cases are much more numerous in which the commentator declares the Prātisākhya to have in contemplation phrases not to be found in the Saṁhitā. They are nearly all of this kind. In iv 11, *viśāḥke* is declared *pragraha*, now the word is divided in *padu*-text, *vi-śāḥke*, and *śāḥke* is by itself a *padu* (according to 1. 48), and therefore, unless there were some other *śāḥke* not a *pragraha* in the Saṁhitā, it would be enough to cite *śāḥke* alone in the rule, hence, as the citation of *bhāgadhe* (p. *bhāga-dhe*) just before implies that the maker of the rule had in view such a word as *uda-dhe*, whose *dhe* was not *pragraha*, so the citation of *viśāḥke* is declared to have in view such a word as *sahasra-śāḥke*, not a *pragraha*, "in another text." The phrases thus quoted from outside the Saṁhitā by the commentator are as follows: under iv 11, *tas-*

mint *sahasraçākhe*, *ārdhve gastre pratishthite*, *brahmasāme pratishthite*, *ayudhrte*, and *prathamaje*, under iv 12, *paçugrapanī* (or *bhūsmagrapanī*), under iv 15, *tam* (or *tām*) *āhuvī hvayante* (or *i ācayati*), *hūti punar* (or *manar*) *juhoti*, and *huti tasmād vvdh* (or *erāh*), under iv 37, *indrāgnī havāmahe*, under xi 5, *pramatis te devānām*, under xi 3, as beginning of an *anuvāka*, *dhātā dei bhya* 'sind, under xi 16, *gayasphāno 'gnishu*. All this, in my view, is false and arbitrary interpretation, the Prātiçākhyā is less careful to limit itself to the *minimum citabile* than the commentator would have it, and it quotes, for example, the whole word *niçākhe* instead of *-çākhe* alone, simply because *çākhe* occurs as *pragāha* only in that word*. The same implication is appealed to by the commentator under xi 9, 15, xi 3, xvi 12 (though without actual citation of phrases), to explain away what would otherwise be unacceptable in the Prātiçākhyā, *naḥam pīlavam* is given under xiii 16, in the course of the unjustifiable exposition of that rule, and *brahman*, though found in the Sanhitā, is credited under xv 8 to another *çākha*. I do not regard anything in this whole class of cases as authorizing us to suppose that the Prātiçākhyā had in view a text including anything not found in the Tattirīya-Sanhitā.

Next, as to citations made in the commentary as if from the text to which the Prātiçākhyā relates, but not found in the Sanhitā. And here I have first to report a few phrases which are among those occurring only in the manuscripts that came last to my hands, and which escaped my notice when preparing for my last search through the Sanhitā, so that I have not looked for them (not having had the courage to undertake the long and tedious quest through the Sanhitā a fourth time for so little). They are *achā-vākah* (xiv 5), *uccā ratnam ayujantu* (ii 49), *tasmād varūpam* (xx 3), *durçyāñ hi* (xxi 16), *naç ud atī* (xiv 10), *prāçnāti* (xiv 9), and *brhaspati śāpate* (xiv 10). Respecting several of these, it is doubtful whether they are not mere corruptions of phrases actually found and referred. Then there is *kaviçastah* (xvi 2), instead of which, by an error, I sought and found *kaviçastāh*. There remain, of quotations hunted for but not discovered, the following: *adya masi vasatī 'tī 'ndram eva* (x 10 O only), *anv enam mātā* (xx 1 Weber refers me for this to Çāṅkh vi 17 2 [?], Âçval iii 3, also Âit Brāh ii 6), *ahorātri pāçve* (viii 7 only W and [?]) O found in Tāitt Âr iii 13 2), *utū pravasa prthivim mitrasya* (v 12 only G M), *upārçaty askandāya* (x 9 only G M), *ca-turhotī* (ii 25 Tāitt Br ii 2 3²), *brahmāndanam pacati* (x 7 Tāitt Br i 1 9³), *yaç chandusām* (xiv 10 O only), *yā prācī dhk* (iv 33 W B O), *varshābhyah* (xiv 16 but I am not certain that I did not satisfy myself with *varshyābhyah* and omit to search for this), *varshyebhīh* (xiv 16 O only, and it reads *varshebhīh*),

* The quotation of *dhātā rāth* (xi 3), to be sure, is more out of the way, and only to be explained as irregularly pleonastic, like that of *nyam eva sa ya* (xi 3), into which the commentator with equal arbitrariness, tries to interpret a very different meaning.

citikanthāya svāhā (xiii 11 only G M), and *sa nah purushat* (xxiii 17 Rīg-V 1991 et al)

Along with these may properly be reported the few phrases which are quoted by the comment, confessedly or impliedly from outside the text contemplated by the Prāticākhyā. Thus, we have under xviii 1 the beginning and concluding words of the Tāttirīya-Brahmana and the Tāttirīya-Ānanyaka (that is to say, of the latter, the concluding words, *ai 'va tapati*, of the fifth *prapāthaka*, with which, accordingly, to the apprehension of our commentator, the whole treatise appears to have ended), under xxiv 6 are given (by G M O) *dvādaśā 'gnishtomasya stotām, pra nakshatrāya devyāya, sa im mamāda nahi karma kartave* (Taitt Bī 11 5 8⁹ etc), and *senhe vyāghra uta yā prādhānu* (Taitt Bī 11 7 7¹ etc), in a quoted verse under xxi 6 is read *rtasya dhārshadam* (Taitt Bī 1 2 1¹² etc), and the comment to xii 3 has *yo 'pām pushpam veda*

Finally, we note that the comment gives, under xviii 1, a word, *bandhuh*, which ought to form the conclusion of the Sanhitā, by its own count, but which is lost in the known manuscripts

In all this, again, there is no satisfactory evidence that the Sanhitā of the Prāticākhyā or its commentators was other than the one we know. The missing citations are in part found in a minority of the MSS, in part, they are perhaps corruptions, in part, they are likely to have been taken by an error of the quoter's recollection from some other Tāttirīya-text—and the remainder, if there be a remainder, is too scanty to prove anything

When we come farther to inquire whether any part of the Tāttirīya-Sanhitā as it exists was not before the authors of the Prāticākhyā, we seem to be brought to the same negative result. There are, to be sure, here and there points in the text which the rules do not cover, but we have reason only to wonder that in executing so immense and intricate a task as that undertaken by the Prāticākhyā there should have been so few oversights. These, so far as they have been discovered, have been pointed out in the notes, I recapitulate them here. The word *raṣṣā* (for *raṣṣāh*), at 14 24, should have been exempted in some way from the operation of rule iii 8, which requires its *ā* to be shortened when separated from the following word. *Devī*, at vi 1 77, is made *pragraha* by the strict letter of rule i 61 (see under 159), though the passage in which it occurs is not one to which that rule was meant to apply. In the rehearsal of cases of elision or non-elision of initial *a* (chapters xi and xii), there are a couple of cases which the commentator is driven into attempting to provide for by forced and false interpretations of the rules (see under i 61 for *ye 'ntarikshe* at iv 5.11², and under xi 3 for *ye uparishu* at 14 33), and I have noted beside (under xii 8, at the end) only *so agnih* at v 2 3³ as unaccounted for thus far (its companion case, *ādihvo asthāt*, is read first in an *ukhya*-passage, at iv 2 1⁴, as Prof Weber has pointed out to me; and *so agnih* may yet find a like solution). And in the enumeration of cases of interior *ñ* (see under xvi 26), two compound words appear to have been overlooked, *svādūshasādam* (iv 6 6³) and *striśaṅśādam* (ii 5 1⁵)

I would repeat here, what I have already said, that my testing of the precise adaptation of the Pratiśakhyā to the Saṁhitā is not absolute, since I possess neither an *index verborum* to the latter nor a *padu*-manuscript, and my results will probably admit of rectification in some points—but I trust not to any such extent as should invalidate the general conclusion.

This conclusion is, that the Pratiśakhyā probably contemplates the same text, neither more nor less, as that which constitutes the Taittirīya-Saṁhitā, the only *śākhā* left us (unless the Kāthaka be regarded as another) of the many which formerly represented the Black Yajur-Veda. The name Taittirīya-Pratiśakhyā, then, is both a convenient and a suitable one to be applied to the treatise.

If, however, this name be understood as implying that the text-book emanates directly from the Taittirīya school, its propriety is much more questionable. Besides the numerous teachers and "holders of *śākhās*" referred to in the rules, whose names in some cases are related with those of traditional schools of the Black Yajus (see Weber's notes to the Caranavyūha, in his Indische Studien, iii 256 ff), three schools are mentioned by name, those of the Mīmāṃsakas (v 41), Āhvārakas (xxiii 14), and Taittirīyas (xxiii 15, 16). Now we do not expect the text-book of a school to name that school, its rules are those which apply "here," "with us," and only outsiders need specification, besides, the Taittirīyas are represented as holding a doctrine which is not that of the treatise itself, although it is deemed of consequence enough to be set forth with a detail elsewhere unknown. We are far from fully comprehending as yet the origin, nature, and relations of the "schools" of Vedic study and then accepted texts or *śākhās*, or the causes which have preserved to us so few of the latter, and of the school-treatises or *pratiśakhyas*, but we must of course assume that there were various degrees of difference among the *śākhās*, and that some were only infinitesimally unlike some others. And it is perhaps possible to point out certain minor points, in which the orthoepical form of the Taittirīya-text as recorded differs from that to be inferred from the Pratiśakhyā.

Among these points we are not allowed to reckon the retention of *h* before sord gutturals and labials and before sibilants (against ix 2), nor of *n* before palatals (against v 24) and *l* (against v 25), nor the omission of *t* (required by v 33) between *t* and *s*, nor of the various duplications and insertions and aspirations taught in chapter xiv, since these are matters on which we are to expect discordance between theory and practice. Nor would it be safe to make anything of the consistent and emphatic acceptance in the Saṁhitā of *anusvāra* as an alphabetic element, while the Pratiśakhyā wavers (see under ii 30) between regarding it as such and as a mere affection of the preceding vowel. Of more consequence is the division of the sections or *anuvākas* in the recorded text into fifties of words, or *kandikās*, which causes the disappearance of more than one specialty of reading expressly prescribed in the treatise (e.g., of the *i* of *uṣṇisā*, at the end of i 3 6¹, see under iii

13) The retention of the final *v* of *av* and *āv* (from *o* and *āu*) before a vowel is also against the letter of rule x 19, and in accordance with a dissident opinion quoted in x 21. The *kampa* of a circumflex accent followed by a circumflex, consistently made in the *Sanhita*, is only mentioned in the *Prātiśākhya* (at xix 3) as taught by some authorities, nor is the form of the doctrine taught in full and clear accordance with the practice followed. And it is very questionable whether the prescription of nasalization of a final protracted *a* (xv 8) is not merely reported by the treatise as made by certain specified teachers. These are small matters, and few, and a degree of doubt, perhaps, hangs over them all, but they are worthy of notice, as being all that we have on which to found any discordance between the *Sanhita* of the manuscripts and that of the *Prātiśākhya*. While, on the other hand, the points of accordance, even in matters which are most specially characteristic of the *Tāttirīya*-text, are very numerous and important.*

Of course, the existence of other forms of the text besides the ordinary *saṃhitā* is assumed by the *Prātiśākhya*. Such a work without a *pada*-text at least as its foundation would be a thing inconceivable. Our treatise does not give, as the others do (see add note 1 to the *Ath Prāt*), formal rules for the construction of any of the other texts, its nearest approach to doing so is in the third chapter, where (see note to iii 1) it teaches us what final or initial vowels, long in *saṃhitā*, are to be shortened whenever the word in which they occur is thrown out of *saṃhitā* with its next neighbor—a form of statement which applies to *kramu* and *jatu* text as well as *pada*. The occurrence of such terms as *pada*, *nānāpada*, *śiṅgya*, *avagruha*, implies also the familiar usages of the *pada*-text, and the employment of *iti* is directly alluded to in iv 4 and ix 20, and indirectly assumed in the use of *ārsha* in ix 21 and x 13. What were the limits to the use of *iti* in the *pada*-text held by the school from which the *Prātiśākhya* proceeded does not appear. Its combination in the extant *pada* with the prepositions (thus *pré 'ti* for *pra*, *ví 'ti* for *vi*, and so on—and without restriction to the ten words which alone are allowed by the *Prātiśākhya*, at i 15, to count as *prepositions*) does not come to light anywhere either in the text or commentary. Nor does the treatise chance to show whether its *pada* treated the *śiṅgyas* or separable compounds after the same manner as the extant *Rik* and *Atharvan* texts—writing simply *upa-āyavaḥ*, for example—or as the extant *padas* of the *Yajur-Veda* (including that to the *Tāttirīya-Sanhita*) and the one assumed by the *Atharva-Prātiśākhya* (see note to *Ath Prāt* iv 74)—writing *upāyava ity upa-āyavaḥ*. The commentator, however, accepts and follows the latter method. Reason has been

* I have pointed out under rule ii 25 that the peculiar *Tāttirīya* orthography of such words as *suvar*, *tanuvā*, *aghmyā* finds no occasion for mention in the *Prātiśākhya*, nor is the very strange change of a final labial in certain words to a guttural (as in *trishṭug vādye*, ii 4 11², *trishṭug yādyā*, ii 6 25, *trishṭugbhāḥ*, v.1 45) noticed anywhere, I presume (I have omitted to obtain distinct information upon the point) that in every such case the *pada* text also has the guttural—which would take the whole matter out of the sphere of the *Prātiśākhya*.

found (under ix 3) for questioning whether in the *pada*-text belonging to the makers of the Prātiśākhya the peculiar rule followed by the known Taittīyīya *pada*-text as to the accentuation of its separable words was of force. The latter text is of a very peculiar, not to say an anomalous, character in many respects, in these it is supported by the Prātiśākhya, so far as the latter goes (I will instance as examples only the treatment of *yod* and *eva*, and other cases noticed under iii 15, of *nīcāḍ*, v 8, and of *ekādikayā*, v 19) whether it does not contain other peculiarities which are ignored by the Prātiśākhya, and which consequently prove it not to be the one which this presupposes, I cannot say, but, from an item or two of information received from Prof. Weber, I imagine that it does so. The question will, at any rate, be cleared up by the discussion of the Taittīyīya *pada*-text which Weber, as I rejoice to learn, intends to add to his translated edition of the Saṁhitā, now going through the press.

I attribute it only to a (very unusual) awkwardness of statement on the part of the Prātiśākhya that it appears to leave a part of the words ending in an original *o* out of the category of *pragrahas* (see under iv 7), and so to deny them the right to be followed by *iti*, as they are in fact followed in the known *pada*-text.

The *krama*-text ("word-krama") appears to be mentioned in rules viii 20 and viii 5, and more unequivocally in xxiv 6 (all of them, however, of suspicious authenticity as original parts of the Prātiśākhya—see below), but it is only three times quoted in the comment (under vii 2, ix 17, 20), and so makes but a small figure there as compared with the *jatā*. Examples from the latter are given under iii 1, v 33, viii 8, 12, 16, 35, ix 22, x 9, 10, 13, xi 9, 16, 17, vii 7, x 2, and sometimes in considerable number and at great length, and once (under xv 2), where the commentator has occasion to mention the various kinds of text, he specifies *samhitā*, *pada*, and *jatā*, ignoring the *krama* altogether. This seems strange, inasmuch as the *jatā* is regarded* as a secondary form of *krama*, and founded upon it, but the simple explanation appears to be that the *krama* brings up no questions of *sandhi* which do not arise also in *samhitā* and *pada*, and so needs no special attention where only methods of *sandhi* are taught, while the inversions of the *jatā* bring new elements into contact, and so create new cases of combination which require to be settled. If we may trust the commentator's interpretation, rules viii 12, 35 are given expressly for cases that arise only in *jatā*-text, under viii 16, he commits an obviously false explanation in order to reach a *jatā*-case, under v 33, he makes a *sandhi* which the Prātiśākhya certainly never intended, because it is required by the letter of the rule, in a case which the makers of the treatise had apparently overlooked, under xi 16, 17, the *jatā* is resorted to, apparently with reason, for counter-examples to justify the form of statement adopted in the rule. The weight of evidence, upon the whole, is decidedly in favor of

* See Dr. Thibaut's "Jatāpatala," Leipzig, 1870.

the assumption that the peculiar *jatî* combinations were had in view by those who constructed the Prâtiśākhya—or, at least, by those who brought it into its present form. I would add, that it seems to me not unlikely that the term *vikrama* (in the sense of *kramavikrîti*) signifies the *jatî*-text in rules xiii 20 and xxi 5.

The names of the divisions of the Samhita, *kānda*, *pragña* (not *prapāthaka*), and *anuvāka*, are found only in the commentary (see Index), respecting the absence of the subdivision of *anuvākas* into *kāndikās* see above, p. 427 (also under viii 35 and xiv 6, where this division is acknowledged by the commentator). But the Prâtiśākhya itself gives names to certain parts of the Samhita, which names, for the sake of convenience, I will put together here, with a reference to the rule under which the part designated by each is stated (for further details of their occurrence, see the Index): they are *agni* (iii 9), *ishiti* (iv 52), *ukhya* (ix 20), *graha* (ix 20), *prsthya* (ix 20), *mahāprsthya* (xi 3), *yāgyā* (iii 9), *rudra* (xi 3), *vāharyu* (xi 3), *vikarsha* (xi 3), *vihavya* (xi 3), and *hvanayava nīya* (ix 20).

A marked feature of the Prâtiśākhya is its frequent citation of authorities by name. The list of names has been repeatedly put together by students of the Prâtiśākhya (in Weber's Indische Studien, iv 77–8, may be found notices respecting the historical and geographical indications derivable from them), but ought not to be omitted here also. It is as follows (including the cases of mention in the commentary, distinguished by an added c):

Āgñiveçya, ix 4
 Āgñiveçyayañña, xiv 32
 Ātreya, v 31, xvii 8
 Ukhya, viii 22, x 20, xvi 24
 Utmottariya, viii 20
 Kādamayina, ix 1, xv 7, 8c
 Kāundinya, v 38, xviii 3, 4c, xix 2, (*sthavina*), v 40c, xvii 4, 5c
 Kāuhaleputra, v 40c, xvii 2 (Kauhaley, xix 4c, xviii 17c)
 Gāutam, v 38
 Paushkarasidi, v 37, 38, 40c, viii 16, xiv 2, 3c, xvii 6
 Plākshāyana, ix 6, xiv 11, 17, xviii 5
 Plakshi, v 38, ix 6, xiv 10, 11c, 17, xviii 5
 Badabhikāri, xiv 13
 Bhāradvāja, xvii 3 (Bharadvāja, v 40c)
 Mātākiya (or Māyakiya), x 22
 Vātsapra, x 23
 Vālmiki, v 36, ix 4, xviii 6
 Cānkhiyana, xv 7, 8c
 Cātyāyana, v 40, xvii 1, 3c, 4c, 7, xviii 2
 Samkṛtya, viii 21, x 21, xvi 16
 Hārīta, xiv 18, 19c, 20c 21c, 22c

Of the three schools cited, the names have been already given (above, p. 427). And we have besides *Ācāryāḥ* quoted in i 46, *eke ācāryāḥ* iii, v 30, ix 5, viii 3, xiv 3, 25, *eke* simply in i 47, ii 19, 27, 47, v 39, viii 19, xi 19, xiv 33, xv 2, 6, xviii 1, xix 3, xvi 13, *pārve* in xv 9, and *sarve* in xviii 7.

The questions which all this array of authorities is called in to help settle may be classified as follows:

I. Matters of phonetic theory, with others of a general nature.

The nature of the tone of a circumflexed syllable, 146-7, with this is combined an uncertainty of view of the *Prātiśākhya* itself, expressed in rules 44-5, there is nothing else like it in the treatise, perhaps we may best assume that rules 44-7 are a later intrusion. The mode of production of *anusvāra* and *svanabhakti*, 119. The quality of the *a*-element in *āi* and *āu*, 1127. The phonetic character of *h* and *ḥ*, 1147-8. The nature of the combination of *e* or *o* with (elided) *u*, 1119. The occurrence of lingual *l*, 11116. This the comment vainly endeavors to make out an accepted doctrine of the *Prātiśākhya*. A denial of the enclitic circumflex, 11132-3. Nasalization of final vowels, 1116-8. The comment treats rule 8 as the direct teaching of the text-book. Accent of protracted vowels (?), 1119. Corieption of the final theme vowel of neuters in *as*, *is*, *us* in the nom. pl. before *ñ*, 11116. Utterance of *āi* final in a single case, 11124. Degrees of nasalization, 1111-5. Utterance of accents and alphabetic sounds generally, 1116-8. *Kampa* between two circumflex syllables, 1113-5. Use of the term *yama* for the nasal counterparts, 11113. Utterance of the syllable *om*, 1111-7. *Yama*-tones held by certain schools, 11114-19.

II. Matters of *sandhi* or euphonic combination

1. The most important cases in this division are two or three in which the views of different authorities are reported without any clear expression by the treatise of the opinion held, or the rule to be followed, by its school. Thus, with regard to the combination of a final mute with an initial *h*, 1138-41, where, indeed, the view first stated, as that of certain specified teachers, is doubtless to be regarded as that of the *Prātiśākhya*, notwithstanding the equivocal way in which it is put forward. Again, at 111, the dropping of final *h* before a sibilant followed by a surd mute must probably in like manner, though referred to the authority of a single teacher, be taken as a binding rule. And it is hard to believe that rule 11119, prescribing the invariable omission of final *v*, was not meant to be modified by 11121. That the treatment of *anusvāra* as a distinct consonantal element is put by 1112-3 upon certain dissidents, must not be looked at by itself alone, it stands connected with the general equivocal attitude assumed by the *Prātiśākhya* with reference to this vexed question in phonetics (see note to 11130). Once more, the mode of duplication in groups beginning with *l* as reported in 1112-3, with reference to the authorities who teach it, seems to be acknowledged by a later rule (1117) as binding: this interpretation, however, is not free from doubt.

2. In all other cases, the *Prātiśākhya* is liberal enough to record the opinions of respected authorities upon points as to which its own teachings are distinctly opposed to theirs. Thus, as to the treatment of *m* before *y* and *v*, 1130 and 1113 (the repeated mention of this shows it to be regarded as a view entitled to the most respectful consideration), the combination of *p* with *ç* and of *n* with *ç* before a consonant, 1136-7, the *sandhi* of *eṣṭar* with *rāyah*, 11119-22, the treatment of *h* before an initial consonant, 114-6, the utterance or omission of final *y* and *n*, 1120-23, the insertion

of a surd mute between spirant and mute, xiv 10-11, aspiration of a mute before a sibilant, xiv 13, duplication in certain specified cases, xiv 17-22, 25-8 (but the comment treats 28 as the direct prescription of the authors of the treatise), and *vikrama* accent after *pracaya*, xix 2

Thus it is evident that, while this arraying of discordant opinions is a quite distinctive and a very interesting feature of our Prāṭihkhyā, it does not, except to a very limited extent, detract from the character of the latter as a consistent and positive record of the views of a school of Vedic study. Nor is it fairly to be brought into any relation to the peculiar character of the Black Yajur-Veda, as a text of which the constituent parts had been gathered together more miscellaneous, and less fully fused into conformity, than the other Vedic texts. No text could be so definitely constructed, and be made the object of so thorough and systematic study as the setting up of a text-book like the Prāṭihkhyā evinces, without assuming an established character, and being as authoritatively handed down and as accurately learned as any Vedic text.

It is by no means improbable that a part of these citations of authorities have been interpolated in the Prāṭihkhyā after the latter ceased to be a mere body of practical rules for the guidance of a school, and, in virtue of its thoroughness and comprehensiveness, gained more the character of a phonetic "treatise" on the Black Yajur-Veda, and was used in other schools than that which originated it. The commentator (as will be pointed out below) uses the citations as a cover under which to put upon the treatise certain doctrines which do not properly belong to it, and in other hands it may have undergone a like distortion in other directions.

Accretions of other kinds to the original text of the Prāṭihkhyā are plausibly to be presumed in various places. All the metrical rules (namely xvi 8, xxi 14, 15, xxiii 2, 14-15, 20, xxiv 5, 6) are to be set down without much question as unauthentic, they are proved such by their character not less than by their form, and several of them are found in other parts of the Prāṭihkhyā literature. We may include in the same category, indeed, with considerable show of reason, the seventeenth and eighteenth chapters, and all that follows the twenty-first, on the score of content alone—a part of their matter is inferior repetition of what had been given before, a part deals with subjects, and in a style, unsuited to a Prāṭihkhyā. That there is room at least to suspect the intrusion of rules in other parts of the work has been pointed out here and there in the notes at this place, I will merely refer to certain rules which are put in strangely out of place, interrupting the natural connection of passages such as i 25-7, 80, vii 13, 14, xiv 12-3, xv 6-9, xvi 24, xxii 3-8, of these, only vii 13, 14 are indispensable parts of a treatise like the present.

Another notable characteristic of our Prāṭihkhyā is its sparing use of technical terms belonging to general grammar, consequent upon its refusal to deal with words or classes of words according to their grammatical character, its laborious definition of its subject-

matter in the *Sanhita* by position and surroundings merely. There are but two cases of its departure from this method: namely, its use of *alopa* at viii 15, and of *samkhyāsu* at xvi 25, and in neither one is its success precisely of a character to make us wish it had gone farther in the same direction. This peculiarity renders impossible any profitable comparison of its phraseology with that of other grammatical works.

The general character of the *Pratigākhya* is that of an earnest, sensible, consistent treatise, thoroughly worked out and dealing with its proper task with completeness and accuracy, and confining itself quite strictly to that task. There is no labored feebleness and artificial obscurity, as in parts of the *Vajasaneyi-Pratigākhya*, nor any inclusion of matters pertaining to general grammar, as in the *Atharva-Pratigākhya*. It has its minor inaccuracies and inconsistencies, its obscurities of *anvrtti* inseparable from the *sūtra*-style, and its rules that seem to defy interpretation; but these are inconspicuous blemishes, no one of the other works of its class is more thoroughly respectable throughout.

Turning, now, to the more special consideration of the commentary, we have to note, as the most important point, a break of continuity between it and the *Pratigākhya*. The commentator is not the recipient of a certain tradition, that gives him surely and precisely the import of the rules which he has to expound, the text-book has come down to him as something authoritative and sacred, indeed, yet in some points obscure, so that he is in doubt as to what it means, in others imperfect, so that it needs emendation, in others not in accordance with the views held by him and his school respecting the text, so that these have to be interpreted into it.

Thus, in the first place, the instances are frequent in which, to his own interpretation of a rule, he adds a different view held by other interpreters: either without naming them (as under i 19, 21, xiii 16, xiv 5, 11, xvii 5, xxiii 7), or referring to one of his special sources and predecessors (as under ii 19, 33), or setting off against one another the views of two of these, *Varaṇuci* and *Mahisheya* (as under ii 14, iv 40, viii 19, 20, 22, xviii 7). In a large proportion of the instances, it is true, the difference of opinion is upon some utterly trivial point, turning on the interpretation of a *tu* or the like, and only illustrating the hair-splitting tendencies of the native exegetes, but in some cases it is of more consequence, and once goes so far as to question (under viii 20) whether an authority referred to is *Uttamottariya* or *Dvavuttamottariya*. Again, where a rule is really obscure, the commentator has sometimes, palpably, nothing more than guesses to give at its meaning, and ventures two or three of them (as under ii 2, xiv 22, xv 9, xix 5, xxiii 17), among which it would be hard to choose the least acceptable, or, if he gives but one (as under xi 19, xvii 4, xxiii 18, 19), it is no less unsatisfactory. There are yet other cases in which what seems to be the evident meaning of a rule is misapprehended and distorted,

without reason (as under ii 52, iv 4, v 29, vii 11, xiv 3) Occasionally, false interpretations, of every degree of violence, are committed, for the purpose either of correcting an oversight or inadequacy of the Prātiśākhya (as under i 61, iii 1, viii 16, xi 3, xvi 26), or else of imposing upon the latter a doctrine which it was not intended to teach, but which is held by the commentator and his school (as under i 58, xiii 4, xxi 14, 16) For this last purpose, too, advantage is sometimes taken of the citations of varying opinions so liberally made in the rules, the *dictum* of the quoted authority is declared to be approved in usage, or is even imposed upon the Prātiśākhya, to the setting aside of what the latter really prescribes Thus, Pāṇskarasādi's doctrine of the conversion of *l* to *ḍ* (xiii 16), which belongs neither to the Prātiśākhya nor to the Saṃhita, is accepted, and the duplication of consonant-groups beginning with *l* which is ascribed (xiv 3) to certain unspecified teachers, and Plakṣhi's mode of treatment of a spirant before a first mute (xiv 17), which has as further result a misinterpretation of xxi 16, and a part of rule xiv 26, respecting the duplication of *l*, and rule xiv 28, to which a strange interpretation is given, prepared for by a yet stranger one of xiii 4, and rules xv 2, 3, which require *anusvāra* instead of nasalization of a vowel, and the nasalization of a final protracted *q* (xv 8), and two rules (xviii 1, 6) from among those which concern the utterance of *om*, and rule x 21, as to the retention of final *v*, is given the preference over 19, which requires its omission, and the first rule (v 38) as to the combination of initial *h* with a preceding mute is ratified, and, in the variety of opinions respecting the circumflex tone, one (i 46) is selected for approval In the few cases where the commentator does not express himself as to whether a rule is *ishita* or *anishita* (they are ii 19, 27, 47-8, xi 19, xiv 2, xxi 13, xiii 14-9), there may be question whether he means to have it regarded as approved, or thinks the matter of no consequence either way There remain the majority of cases, in which he stands by the Prātiśākhya, rejecting the intruded doctrine (for further details, refer to the words *ishita* and *anishita* in the Sanskrit index)

Besides these more serious cases of misapprehension or intended modification of the teachings of his text-book, the commentator is not free from the ordinary and characteristic weaknesses of his craft in India from feeble and puerile expositions, from attempts to find a wonderful pregnancy of meaning in some innocent particle or unintended difference of expression, from groundless etymologies, and the like, to these attention has been directed in the notes, and they are not of consequence enough to be recapitulated here

For determining the personality of the commentator we have no data whatever, and for his place and period we have only the references to other authorities, which, though too few and indefinite to yield any statable result, need to be put together in this note The three earlier commentators on whom the work is avowedly founded—namely, Vararuci, Mahisheya, and Ātreya—are repeatedly appealed to, especially (as has been pointed out above)

in the settlement of difficult or controverted points (for the details, see index). Varanuci is a name very common in grammatical literature, to identify our commentator with any other of the various individuals who have worn it would doubtless be daring in the extreme. Nor does Ātreya, probably, stand in any definable relation to the grammarian of that name who is (see p. 430) twice quoted in the *Pratīṣākhya* itself. From Pāṇini, rules are directly quoted under ii 12, iii 9, v 1, viii 16, xiv 4, xviv 3, and the *pāṇinī-gaṇ* or the *vṛkṣakāṇa* are further referred to under i 15, 53, 57, ii 17, viii 1. Pāṇine in terms are, further, *nañ*, i 60, x 22, *me*, ii 17, *hal*, ix 24, *ga*, xiv 4, and *lyap*, xxi 14. The Mahābhāṣya is professedly quoted under ii 7, v 2, but the passage given is actually from Kuyyā's gloss. A definition is taken from the *Amaraṅga* under i 1. Kūhileyā is quoted under xiv 4, xviii 17, and the *Kāṣṭhīyā* under xviii 1. The *Bṛāhmaṇa* of the Vajasaneyins is referred to under xiv 33, and extracts from the Mahābhārata and various Purāṇas are set forth under xxiv 6.

But the authority most often appealed to is the "Çikṣhā," by which the commentator intends a very different work from the *pāṇinīya* Çikṣhā, and one much more comprehensive. He takes extracts from it, of a verse, or part of a verse, or more than one verse, under i 1 (three times), ii 2, xiv 5, 28, xix 3, x 12, xxi 1, 15, xii 13, xviii 10, 17. Among these extracts are (under i 1, ii 2, xxi 1, xviii 10) several passages which are found also in the *pāṇinīya* Çikṣhā, and among the metrical extracts which are now and then given without specifying their source (under xiv 23, 26, 28, xix 3, xxi 1, 6, 15, xviii 17, 19, xviv 6) are likewise one or two (under xviii 17, 19) which occur in the same treatise. That the commentator is inclined to regard his Çikṣhā as of higher authority than the *Pratīṣākhya* itself was pointed out under xv 12, that it was a work specially appertaining to the Tāttvīya-Saṁhitā may be inferred with probability from the words which it cites (under xxi 15) in illustration of the varieties of *śarabhaṭi*.

ANALYSIS

I EXPLANATORY TERMS AND THEIR USE, INTERPRETATION OF RULES, ETC

1 *Terms and their use*

hara forms names of letters, xxii 4, of vowels, i 16, of consonants, i 17, exceptions, i 18 — *varna* forms names of letters xxii 4, includes short, long, and protracted vowels, i 20 — *epha* forms name of *ṛ*, i 19 — *varḡu*, with first mute, forms name of series, i 27 — *a* forms name of consonant, i 21, of a cited word, i 22 — *apṛkṭa*, a *pada* of a single letter, i 54 — *avagraha*, first member of a separable word, i 49 — *lopa*, loss, i 57 — *upasaṅga*, 'preposition,' includes what words, i 15 — offices of *ca*, *api*, *tu*, *atha*, *eva*, *va*, *na*, xii 5–8

2 *Interpretation of rules and forms, etc*

an increment, or word having euphonic change or elision, put in nominative, i 23, or in its text form, i 24 — product of euphonic change put in accusative, i 28 — next element, or more, taken in case of doubt, i 25, 26 — a cited *pada* means that *pada* only, i 50, but applies to it even when euphonicallv altered, or preceded by *a* or *an*, i 51–3 — rules for a specified passage apply only there, and peremptorily, i 59, but a series of three or more words, if repeated, reads as the first time, i 61 — *pūṛva*, 'preceding,' and *uttara*, 'following' designate a word only under the specified circumstances i 29, 30 — continued implication is of what stood last, i 58 — words to be combined, and rules to be applied, in their order, v 3 — a separable word treated as two words, except in enumeration, i 48 — an *apṛkṭa* treated as initial and as final, i 55 — elision and euphonic alteration affect single letters only, i 56, after elision of *y* or *v*, no farther combination made, x 25 — in *pragrahas* and in enumeration of words containing *anusvāra* a cause in another word maintains its force, i 60

II PHONETIC ENUMERATION, CLASSIFICATION, DESCRIPTION OF ALPHABETIC SOUNDS, QUANTITY, ACCENT, ETC

1 *Enumeration and classification of alphabetic sounds*

nine simple vowels [*a*, *ā*, *uṣ*, *ṛ*, *ṛ*, *ṛṣ*, *u*, *uṣ*], i 2, sixteen vowels [the above, with *ṛ*, *ṛ*, *ḷ*, *ḷ*, *ḷ*, *o* *au*], i 5, the rest consonants, i 6 — mutes, i 7, in five series, i 10, called "first" etc., i 11 — semivowels [*y*, *r*, *ḷ*, *v*], i 8 — spirants [*ś*, *ḥ*, *ṣ*, *ḥ*], i 9 — surd consonants, i 12, *h*, i 13, sonants i 14

2 *Mode of formation of alphabetic sounds*

general mode of production of articulate sounds, ii 2, 3, 7, xvii 7, 8, xxii 1, 2, xxiii 2, 3 — difference of surds, sonants, and *h*, ii 4–6 — mode of utterance of vowels, in general, ii 4, 8, 31, 32, in particular, of *a*, *ā*, ii 12, of *ṛ*, *ṛ*, ii 20–22, of *u*, *ū*, ii 20, 24, 25, of *ṛ*, *ṛ*, *ḷ*, ii 18, of *e*, ii 15–17, 23 of *ai* ii 26–8, of *o*, ii 13, 14, of *au*, ii 26, 27, 29 — similar vowels, i 3, 4 — mode of utterance of consonants, in general, ii 33–34, of sonants, ii 8, of surds ii 10, 11, of *h* and sonant aspirates, ii 6, 9, of nasality, ii 52, difference of nasal quality in different nasal sounds, xvii 1–4, of nasal mutes, ii 30 — mode of utterance of consonants in particular of *k*-series, ii 35, of *c*-series, ii 36, of *t*-series, ii 37, of *ṭ*-series, ii 38, of *y*-series, ii 39, of *y*, ii 40, of *ṛ*, ii 41 of *ḷ*, ii 42, of *v*, ii 43, of *ś*; i

nants, ii 44,45, of *h*, ii 6,9,46,47, of *visarjanīya*, ii 46,48, of *anusvara*, ii 19, 30, of *nasikyas* (*yamas* etc), ii 49-51, of *śarabhakti*, ii 19

3 Quantity

quantity of short and long vowels, i 31-3,35, of protracted vowels, i 36, of consonants, i 37, of *anusvara* (or nasalized vowel), i 34, xvii 5, of syllables ('heavy' and 'light'), xii 14,15, of pauses and hiatus, xii 13, of *om* viii 1

4 Accent

general character of accents acute, i 38, xii 9, grave, i 39, xii 10, circumflex, i 40-47 xvii 6—varieties of independent circumflex *natya* or original xx 2, its quality, xx 9 *lshūpra* xx 1, its occurrence, x 16 its quality xx 9 *abhihata*, xx 4, its occurrence, xii 9, its quality, xx 10 *prāśhita*, ix 5, its occurrence, x 17, its quality, x 11—enclitic circumflex its occurrence xiv 29-33, its varieties *prāhata*, xx 3, its quality, xx 11 *padārtha*, xx 6, its quality, xx 12 *turovyañjana* xx 7 its quality xx 12—*prācāya* accent, xi 10,11—*vikāma*, ix 1,2, its quality, xvi 6—*kampa*, between two circumflexes, xiv 3-5—accent resulting from combination of two syllables into one, x 10,12,16,17, xii 9-11—accent of *om*, xiii 2,3,5-7—accent of protracted vowel (?), xv 9

5 Syllabication

division of syllables, xvi 1-9

6 Mode and tones of utterance

general mode of utterance xiii 20, the three *sthānas* or qualities, xii 11, the seven do, xiii 4-10, the twenty one *yamas* or tones, xii 12, xiii 11-19—tone of *om*, xviii 4

III SANDHI OR EUPHONIC COMBINATION

introductory, v 1-3, four kinds of combination, xxiv 1-4

1 Final vowels

final vowels not liable to combination, *pragrahas*, iv 1-54, x 24, special cases of uncombinable finals, x 13 18, protracted finals, x 24, their nasalization, xv 7,8—nasalization of final vowels, xv 6—the particle *u*, ix 16,17—lengthening of final *a*, iii 2-6,8-12, of final *e* and *u*, iii 7,13,14

combination of simple final vowels with similar initial, x 2, of final *a* with initial vowels, x 4-9, exceptions, x 13, lost in certain cases before *e* or *o*, x 14, *i*, *ṛ*, *u*, final, x 15, ix 17, exceptions, ix 16, x 18—combination of final diphthongs, ix 11,12,14,15, *e* and *o* with initial *a* (see also Initial vowels), ix 13, treatment of the resulting *y* and *v*, x 19-23, after their loss no further combination, x 25

accent resulting from combinations of final vowels, x 10,12,16 17, xx 1,5,9,11, resulting nasalization, x 11

2 Initial vowels

initial vowel lengthened, iii 15—loss of *a* after final *e* or *o*, ix 13 xi 1, detail of cases of loss and exceptions xi 2-19, xii 1-8 resulting accent, xii 9-11, xx 4,10—*to ar* in special case, v 9

3 *Final consonants*

surd to nasal before nasal, vii 2, to sonant before all other sonant letters, vii 3, and, in a special case, before *m*, vii 4, to aspirate before spirant, xiv 12, 13

visargaṇya to spirant before surds, ix 2-6, except before *ksḥ*, ix 3, to *śḥ* before *ṭ*, in certain cases, vi 5 —omitted before spirant and surd mute, ix 1, also in *sa* etc, v 15-17, also before *r*, vii 7 16, 17, special case before *ṛ*, vii 18-22 —changed to *r*, vii 6, do after *a* and *ā*, vii 8-15, exceptional cases, v 10 —changed to *s* or *śḥ* before *k*, *kh*, *p*, in compound words, vii 23, do in independent words, vii 24-35, exceptions, vii 32, 33 —*ah* final to *o*, before *a* and sonants, ix 7, 8, special exception vii 18-22, before other vowels ix 10, *ah* final, ix 9, 10

final mutes *n* doubled before vowel, ix 18, *n* before *s*, *śḥ*, v 32 —*t* before *s*, *śḥ*, v 33 —*t* before palatals, v 22, 23, before *ḷ*, v 25 before *ṛ*, v 22 —*n* before palatals, v 20, 21, 24, 37, xv 1-3, before *ṭ*, vi 14, xv 1-3, before *ḷ*, v 25, 26, 31, xv 1-3, before *ṣ*, v 24, before *s*, *śḥ*, v 33, changed to *r* or *y* [i e to *anuvāra*, xv 1-3] ix 20-24, doubled before vowel, ix 19 —*m* before mutes and semivowels, v 27-31, xii 3, before spirants and *ṛ*, xii 1 2, xi 1-3 unchanged before *ṛā*, xii 4, special case of loss, v 18

4 *Initial consonants*

ç to *ch*, v 34-7 —*s* to *śḥ*, in words independent or compound, v 10, vi 1, 2, 4 6-13 —*t* to *ṭ* vi 13 —*h* after a mute, v 38-41 —*n* to *ṇ*, vii 2, 4
elision of initial *m*, v 12, of *v*, v 13, of *s*, v 14

5 *Interior consonants*

ṭ, *ḷ* to *t*, *ṭh* vii 13, 14 —*n* to *ṇ* in same word with its cause, xii 6-9, 11, 13-15, in other word, vii 3, 5, 6-12, 15, 16 —*s* to *śḥ*, vi 3 —*l* to *ḷ*, xii 16

6 *Abnormal insertions and elisions duplication, etc*

insertion of *s* v 4-7, of *d*, v 8, of surd mute between sibilant and mute, xiv 9-11, of nasal counterparts (*yamas* and *nusikya*), xxi 12-14, of *śma* *abhakti*, xxi 15-16

elision of initial *m*, *n*, *s*, see Initial consonants —in composition of forms of *eka*, v 18, 19

duplication in consonant groups, xiv 1-7, 14-28, of initial *ch* *kh*, *bh* in certain cases, xiv 8

IV SUNDRIES

enumeration and specification of cases of *n*, otherwise than euphonic, in interior of words, xii 9, 10, 12, of *anuvāra*, do do, xv 4, 5, xxvi 2-31

requirements in a scholar or teacher, xxiv 5, 6

INDEX OF CITATIONS

MADE IN THE COMMENTARY, FROM THE TAITTIRIYA SANHITĀ

THIS Index contains the references reported above in the body of the work, as made by the commentator to the fundamental text. If, however, a cited word or passage is reported as occurring more than once in the text, reference is given only to the first occurrence. It has been found impracticable to carry out any scheme of distinction of the value of the citations, and any one using the Index will have to turn back to the notes in order to determine whether a given passage is quoted merely as an example of some general class, or as one that was more or less probably had directly in view, as example or counter example, by the makers of the treatise, whether it is a unique phrase, or one more than once repeated, or even a word of frequent occurrence—and so on.

TS 1	TS 1	TS 1
1 1 1 21,33, 11 22, 11 1,3, 1x 1, x 5,10,19, xiv 21, xvii 7, xviii 1,7, x x 3, xxi 7, xxv 13	2 12 1 xi 11,17, 2 xvi 27	4 14 11 44, ix 4
2 1 xii 2, x 1, xxi 15, 2 x 2, xxiv 5	13 1 iii 2, iv 34, 2 iii 7, iv 15,22,33, xvi 2, 2 iv 46, xi 17	16 xvi 13
3 iv 6, viii 8, xvi 27	14 1 iii 8, ix 20,23, xii 7, xvi 15,27, 2 i 48, ii 47, iv 28, v 8, vi 5, viii 24, x 16, xii 15, xiv 6, xvi 13, 2 i 56, v 15, v 17, vii 10, xvi 14, 4 xiv 10, xvi 13, 6 viii 8, 6 viii 8, 6 viii 11, xi 4, xvi 2, 7 vi 2, viii 24, xvi 25	18 iv 41, x 16
4 1 viii 8	3 1 i 61	19 vi 7, ix 20
5 1 iv 44, ix 22, x 25, xi 16, 2 vi 11, xii 7, xiv 4	2 1 viii 11, 2 iv 12, vi 11, xiv 28	20 xvi 1 xvi 4
7 1 x 10	3 1 51,60, iii 1, vii 6 <i>tes</i>	22 iii 12, iv 4,12, xvi 13,29
8 vi 5, x 2,6, xi 8,16, xiv 1	4 1 viii 26, x 13,16	24 vi 5, xi 13
9 1 vi 10, vii 14, 2 iii 15, v 2,21, x 13 <i>bas</i> , xi 16, xiv 12,13	5 xiv 26	25 xii 9
10 1 vi 5, vii 14, xiv 10, xvi 2,27, 2 v 3, vi 4, xi 16, 2 ii 48, vii 13, ix 2, xvi 14	6 1 iv 42, 1 6 viii 13, 2 i 33, x 10, end'g xiv 6	26 iv 42
11 1 xii 6	7 1 iii 8, iv 11,47, viii 16, 2 viii 9 x 16	27 vi 7, viii 27
12 iii 3, v 5, viii 8, xi 17, xiv 19	8 1 iii 8, 2 iii 2, ix 22	30 iv 11
13 1 ii 20, ix 22 <i>bas</i> , 2 viii 10 <i>bas</i> , xvi 26, 2 iv 12, ix 9, xii 8, xxi 12	9 1 i 37, x 38 <i>bas</i> , viii 2, xiv 12,20 <i>bas</i> , xxi 8	38 i 55, iii 14, vi 5, xi 3
14 1 i 61, iii 8,9,10, 2 viii 23, xi 3, xii 7, 2 i 61, xi 3, 9, xii 16, 4 iii 12, v 17, vi 5 <i>bas</i> , vii 5,10, ix 22, x 10,25, xii 3	10 1 xvi 17, 2 xii 14, xvi 23	36 viii 32
2 1 i 10, x 19,22,25, xi 8, xviii 7, 2 vi 18	11 xi 17	41 ii 49, iv 24
2 1 iv 47, iv 9, 1 1 iv 42, 2 xvi 3, 2 vi 12, x 2, 17	12 ix 21, xi 18	43 vii 16, ix 20
3 1 xi 13 <i>bas</i> , 2 iii 5, xi 8	13 1 2 v 13, 2 iv 20, viii 9	44 1 i 61, vi 9 2 xvi 26
4 1 xi 3, xvi 2, 2 xi 3	14 1 i 61, iii 12, ix 23, xiv 23, xvi 17 x 12, 2 iii 10, 2 2 viii 12, 2 x 15, xii 7, 4 i 61, 6 viii 9, viii 28,34, xii 5, 6 viii 5, 7 iv 6, xvi 14, 6 viii 31 ix 22	45 1 viii 2, vi 5, 2 viii 24, xii 12, xxi 4, 4 iv 21, xi 7, xi 4
5 1 xvi 29 x 1,7	4 1 iii 5, ix 20, viii 15, 2 iv 38, vi 13	46 1 viii 8, xiv 30,31, xi 3, 2 xii 15
6 xi 10,17, xii 10, xvi 29, xvi 6	2 1 viii 27	5 1 i 28,30, xiv 23 xvi 2, 2 iv 19, x 10,13, 2 i 28,30, xi 7
7 iii 5, iv 9 <i>bas</i> , iv 28	3 1 viii 10	2 1 iv 20, xiv 23, 2 iv 16, 2 iv 15, 2 x 10
8 1 xi 21,22, x 10, xi 16,17, 2 i 56, v 10	4 1 xvi 10	3 1 ii 48, 2 xiv 18, 2 iii 8, ix 22
9 iii 2, viii 27,28	9 1 v 27, xxi 12	4 2 x 8, 4 v 28,31, xiv 28
10 1 iii 8, ix 21, 2 iv 52	9 1 v 27, xxi 12	5 1 i 31, xi 3 <i>bas</i> , xiv 9,19, 27, 2 xvi 13, 4 iii 4
11 1 viii 8,18-22,29, x 14, xvi 29, 2 xi 16	10 iv 42, vi 4	6 1 x 10, xiv 23, 2 iii 8, viii 8, 2 iii 8, xi 13, 4 iii 5, v 32, xiv 5,12, 13, xxi 5
	11 xi 16, xvi 25	7 1 xi 15, 2 iv 38, 4 ii 49, x 15,37, xiv 24, 6 viii 5, vi 14, xvi 27
	13 xi 17	8 2 xi 16

TS 1

- 5 10 ¹iv 17,38,42, ²iv 13,14,
xx 8, ³iv 16, ⁴iv
16, ⁵ix 22, xi 12, ⁶iv
22
11 ¹viii 38, xvi 2,19, ²iii 2,
xiii 14, ⁴iii 14, ⁶iii
10
6 1 ¹ii 25
2 ¹xi 11,17, xiv 32, xiv 1,
xxiv 5, ²xi 16, ³xvi
13
3 ¹ix 21, xi 3 xiv 28,
²xvi 19
5 ¹iv 14, xi 16, ²iii 7
6 ¹xii 11, ⁴ix 21 *quaten*,
22, xi 16
7 ¹iv 36, xxi 6, ²v 13, x
16, xiv 11, ⁴xi 16
8 ¹xxi 15, ²iv 49, v 18,
³xii 3,11
10 ¹iii 7, ²xvi 15, ⁴v 27,
xiii 3, xvii 1, ⁶x 8
11 ¹iv 6, ²vii 6, ⁴xiii 9
12 ¹iii 8, v 13, viii 24,32,
²iii 12, xiv 12, ³xiii
7, ⁴iii 10, iv 7, v 29,
viii 15, v 22, xiii 4,
xiv 4, xvi 21, xii 5,
⁴xii 5,11, xvi 29, ⁶iii
10, ix 13, xii 8, x 3,
⁶ix 20,23, xii 7, xiii
12
7 1 ¹ix 22, ²iv 44, ³iv 9,
11, xxi 12,14
2 ¹v 35, xv 7, ²i 39, xvii
6, xiv 2, xiii 17,
xxiv 5 *du*, ⁴v 13
3 ¹iii 6, xxi 5, ⁴ix 21,
xxiv 5
4 ¹xiv 16 *du*
6 ¹vii 8
7 ¹viii 27, xi 3, ²viii 4, xi
3, xii 7 *du*, xiv 23
8 ¹xxi 5, ²iv 20, xi 3, xii
4, ³v 15, xii 7, xiii 12,
⁴xvi 13 *du*
9 ¹i 30, viii 7,13,16, ²viii
13,29 ix 22, xii 7
10 ¹xiii 15, ²xiv 27, ³i 61,
vi 4
11 ¹v 25,31, ix 10
12 ²vi 2
13 ¹iv 18, xiv 24, ²iii 12,
⁴vi 2, viii 8, xvi 4
8 ¹iii 14, vi 2, vii 2 *du*
4 ¹iii 12, vii 12, xv 6
5 ¹iv 48, vii 16, ix 21, xiv
20, xvi 17, ²ix 21,
xiii 13
6 ¹xii 11, ²xiv 4
7 ¹xiv 2, xx 2,8
9 ¹xiii 15, ³v 20, xv 1
10 ²iii 1,11, v 10, viii 13, xi
17
11 ¹vi 3, xiv 6
12 ²iv 11,13, xi 15 *du*,
³xiii 12
13 ¹xiv 20, ²iv 11, ³xvi 20,
²ix 11, x 10, xvi 22

TS 1

- 8 14 ¹iii 13, viii 94
15 ¹iv 7, xvi 2
16 ¹i 58, v 29, vi 4, xiii 4,
xv 8, ²i 58, ii 52, xv
8 *du*, xvi 1
18 xvi 13
21 v 32, xi 17, xiv 12
22 ¹ii 4, ²iii 14, ³xvi 14
du

TS 11

- 1 2 ¹iv 6, ix 7, xi 1, xii 9,
x 4,6,8, ²iv 12, ³ix
2,4,5,6, xiv 9,10,11,
15, ⁴xiv 26, xvi 15,
⁵vii 11, xiv 9 *du*, 11
du, xxi 14
3 ¹xvi 2, ²iv 12, ³vi 12,
⁴ix 26
4 ¹iv 12,53
5 ¹xi 7, ²iv 14, ³iii 7
7 ²v 25, xiv 23, ⁴iii 4, viii
16, ⁷xvi 21
8 ¹xvi 21,26, ²iv 26, x
2
9 ²xi 8, ³iv 3,4,11,51
10 ¹xvi 2
11 ¹v 12, xiii 13, ²iii 7
³iii 10, ⁴iii 5, v 14, vi
5, iv 40, ix 24, xiii
12, xvi 4, ⁶iii 13, iv
10, v 12, xiii 15
2 2 ¹v 9, ⁴iii 7
3 ²iii 49
4 ¹i 61, ²ix 21, ³xiv 15,
⁴i 61, vi 13, vi 16
5 ¹xiv 16, xxi 5, ²iii 2,
³xiv 5, ⁷iv 40
6 ¹xiv 40, ²xiii 12 *du*
7 ¹iii 5, ²xiii 1 *du*, xi 4,
³iv 52, xi 6
8 ²ix 1 *du*, ³v 32, ix 18
9 ²iv 2, ³iv 21, ⁷iv 7, xv
6
10 ²i 43, ix 52
11 ²ix 3
12 ¹viii 24, xiv 9,24,27, ⁴v
38, xiv 20, xxi 3, ⁶xii
7, ⁶iii 7,12, xii 2,4,
⁷iv 12, ⁸iii 5, vii 2,
viii 16, x 10,21,22, xv
6
3 1 ¹ix 1, xii 4
2 ¹iv 53, ⁴ii 44, ⁶ix 4,
⁸ix 16
3 ¹iv 53, xiii 13
4 ¹xiii 14, ²iv 52, vii 5
5 ¹ix 10, ²ix 10, ³iv 20,
xx 2
7 ¹ix 16
8 ¹xiii 12, ²iv 11
9 ¹viii 26, xi 3
10 ¹xx 3, ²ii 48
11 ¹iv 42, ix 11, x 22, x 5,
xiii 13, ²viii 24
12 ¹v 21
13 ²ii 44, xiv 9,10,11,15
14 ¹iv 15, ²v 17, xiii 9,
⁴xii 7, ⁵iv 34, v 8

TS 11

- 4 1 ¹iii 7 v 24,33, ix 19,
xi 10, xxi 10, ⁴xvi
13
2 ¹iv 19, ²iv 12, xiii 14,
xvi 29
3 ²ix 4
4 ¹xiii 1
5 ¹v 2, vii 2, x 13,15
6 ²xiv 15
7 ¹iii 5, viii 11, ²iii 12,
xi 16
8 ²iii 10 *du*, 12
9 ²xvi 31
10 ¹iv 8,28, ²iii 5, iv 24,
ix 11, x 19, xxi 15
11 ¹ix 16, ²iv 2, ³vi 14,
⁴iii 2, xiii 15
12 ¹iv 6, vii 6, viii 8, ix 12,
xi 6, ⁴iii 9, ⁶xv 7
13 ¹x 7, xiii 8, xiv 23
14 ¹v 5, xii 8, xiv 11, xxi
14 ²xii 7, ³iii 8, ⁴vi
2, viii 12
5 1 ²xvi 8 *du*, ³ix 13, xi 1,
xii 9, x 4, ⁷iii 9
2 ¹iv 2, ²iv 53, ³iv 23,29,
52, xvi 30
3 ¹iv 13, ²iv 13, ³vi 9,
x 10, xxi 20
4 ²iii 2
5 ²iv 52, xiii 12, ³ix 4, xiv
7 *du*, ⁴xvi 11, ⁵iv 11
6 ¹iv 44, ²ii 46, ³iii 8,
⁴iv 42,44, x 24, ⁵i 60,
ix 11 44, xvi 11, xxi
5
7 ¹xvi 15, ²xiv 16, ⁴ix
33
8 ¹ix 4, ²xvi 13, ³iv 14
9 ¹ix 21, x 10 *du*, ²xvi 13,
20, ³vi 14, ix 21, xiv
10, ⁴ix 22
10 ¹vi 14, xii 1, xvi 25
11 ²xvi 13
12 ¹iv 52, vi 5, viii 13, ²iii
3, xiv 23, xxi 13,
³xvi 25, ⁴v 2, x 13,
xiv 31, xxi 5, ⁵vi 1,
xii 8
6 2 ¹iv 12,44, xiii 16, ²ii 49,
ix 30, ³xix 2, ⁴iv
53, ⁵ix 12
3 ⁴x 10, ⁵iv 40
5 ¹iv 25, ²x 10, ³iv 25,
⁴iv 32, xxi 1
6 ¹xvi 13, xxi 5, ²viii
33, ³iv 11, v 13, x 16
7 ¹iv 39, viii 9, ²iv 7, xv
8, xxi 2, ⁴x 10, ⁵iv
23
8 ⁴xvi 26
9 ¹iv 44, ⁴iii 7, ⁵iv 29, ix
19, xiv 28, ⁶xvi 30.
10 ²v 22, ³ii 8, ⁴vi 7
11 ¹iii 8,9, xiii 2, xx 8, ²vi
2, xi 4, xiii 10, xvi 29,
³iii 8, vii 2, viii 25, x
10, xiv 1, ⁴iii 9, viii
24, xiii 2, xvi 20

- TS ii
6 12¹ ii 49, xii 15, ²iii 12,
xiv 5,23, ³ix 21, xi 4,
⁴i 21, iii 9, xi 4, ⁵xiv
5, ⁶xii 7, xiv 4, xvi 2
- TS iii
1 1¹ v 15
2 1¹ v 15
3 1¹ 59, iv 52
4 1¹ ix 21, xi 10, xvi 29,
¹iv 28, ²ix 22 b¹,
³xi 14, ⁴vi 14
6 1¹ x 8,10
7 1¹ ix 3, ²iii 5, ³iv 36,
xvi 20
8 1¹ xii 9, xi 10
9 1¹ vi 14, ²ix 21 xi 9,13,
³xiv 18, xvi 20
10 1¹ xi 3 ter, ²vii 15, viii
28 b¹, ix 20,21
11 1¹ iii 3, ix 20, ²viii 8,29,
xiv 24, xvi 13, ³iv
11, ⁴xii 9, ⁵v 2, x
13, xv 6, ⁶iii 8, xii 8,
⁷xv 4, ⁸iii 8,10, x 12,
xiv 21, x 2
22 1¹ 53, xi 17, xvi 18, 29
b¹, ²v 7, xi 5, ³i 40,
ix 24, v 33, vi 14 b¹,
xiv 16,18, xxi 16
3 1¹ viii 28, xii 4
4 1¹ ii 20, iv 42, xi 15,16,
²iv 47, viii 24, ³iv 38,
vii 10
5 1¹ v 3, viii 29, ix 16, ²i
50, iv 11, ³viii 13, xi
12, xvi 16, ⁴iv 46, vi
14, ⁵xi 17
6 1¹ 29, iv 13
7 1¹ viii 8
8 1¹ v 3, xi 3, xii 15, xiv 5,
²vi 2, ³iii 8, viii 23,
ix 19, xi 3, xii 8 b¹,
⁴iv 35, xi 3 ⁵viii 6,
ix 22 b¹
9 1¹ iv 54, viii 3, xxiiv 5,
²vi 14, ³xv 4, xvi 2,
⁴viii 24, ix 18, xvi 2
10 1¹ iv 35, v 27, viii 27,31,
xiv 23, x 3
11 1¹ iii 11, iv 6,7, viii 6,
²viii 24, ³ix 24, ⁴iv
12, x 12, xiv 29 v 1,
3, xvi 4, xxiiv 4
3 1¹ xi 10
2 1¹ viii 8, xiv 24
3 1¹ xi 16
4 1¹ ii 25,30
6 1¹ iv 40
7 1¹ iv 12, xv 6
8 1¹ i 40 ²v 9, xi 16,17,
xiv 30, xvi 27 ³iii 6
9 1¹ viii 8
10 1¹ iii 12, viii 2, ²iv 12,34,
xi 17, x 5
11 1¹ i 43,46,47,52, iv 35, v
13, xii 2, xvi 6,
²xii 7, ³viii 26, ⁴vii
9, xvi 18
- TS iii
4 2¹ ii 12
3 1¹ iv 42 b¹, 52, ²iv 24,
³xii 7, ⁴xii 12
4 1¹ v 23
7 1¹ xvi 15, xxi 12
8 1¹ xiv 23, ²v 24, viii 4,
³v 33
9 1¹ iv,7,11
10 1¹ viii 27, xi 17, ²vii 8
11 1¹ xii 7, ²iii 10, ³iii 7,
xii 13, xiv 28, ⁴xii
7
5 1¹ i 9, xii 15
2 1¹ vi 14
3 1¹ ix 22, xii 15, ²xi 10
4 1¹ xi 16, ²iii 12, ³vi 14,
xi 16, xxi 12
5 1¹ ii 25, xvi 14, ²i 49, iii
2, xi 16, xvi 17
6 1¹ viii 27, ²iii 5
7 1¹ vi 2, ²v 24, xiv 18
8 1¹ ii 7,15, xiv 2,22
10 1¹ i 50, iv 10
11 1¹ i 51, iii 3,7,11, v 21, vi
2, ²iii 12, xvi 18,
⁴iii 11, viii 11
- TS iv
1 1¹ ix 4,5,6, ²vii 6, xi 3,
³iii 5
2 1¹ 61, xvi 5, xxi 11,
²xii 6 b¹, xii 9,14,
³ix 23, xiv 5, ⁴viii
8, ⁵i 61, viii 24, xxi
5
3 1¹ iv 52, xii 6, ²iv 11 b¹,
19 b¹, viii 10, ix 18,
⁴iii 8, xii 4,6
4 1¹ 61, iii 8 ²61, iii 12,
14, vi 2, viii 2 b¹,
⁴iii 5
5 1¹ iii 1,8,10, vi 2,4, ³xvi
2, ⁴ix 23
6 1¹ xii 7
7 1¹ xi 4, ²xii 8, ³viii 24,
xii 7
8 1¹ iv 2, ²i 57, ³iv 20, v
12, xii 7 b¹, xxiiv 5,
³xii 4, ⁴iv 20,27
9 1¹ viii 28, x 2, ³iii 8,
viii 10, xii 7 b¹, xiv 5
10 1¹ xii 7, xxi 12, ²viii 29,
vii 7, xii 12, xiv 1,
xvi 19, ³v 35, vi 14,
ix 24, xii 2, xiv 5,
xv 1, xvi 1,4, ⁴iv 11,
xii 4, ⁵viii 16,18,
xii 7, ⁶viii 27, xii 2
11 1¹ v 17, viii 32, ²iv 11,
xii 4, xiv 19, ³iv 12,
20, ⁴iv 11 b¹, 19 b¹,
23 b¹
2 1¹ ix 3, xii 7, ²i 60, vi 2
2 1¹ iii 10, xxi 12, ³xii 7
3 1¹ xii 8,10, xiv 5, xvi 13,
²iii 10, vi 5, xxi 14,
³v 17, viii 8, x 10,25,
xii 3, ⁴iii 8, xi 5, xvi
28
- TS iv
2 4 1¹ xii 7, ²xvi 18, ³iii 5,
vii 7, xii 7, xvi 19,
⁴xvi 25
5 1¹ viii 8, ²iii 12, xiv 9,
11, ³iii 7, ⁴iii 5
6 1¹ viii 23, x 22, ³xii 8,
⁴iii 2, viii 32, ⁵x 22
7 1¹ vi 18
8 1¹ iv 5, vi 2, viii 6, x 15,
19, xiv 5, x 8, ²vi
4, viii 8,9,32, ³i 61,
ix 20, xi 3, xii 7
9 1¹ iii 15, v 12, x 13, xii 2,
7, ²iv 45, viii 28, xiv
23,29, x 3, xxi 11,
³ix 20
10 1¹ xv 5, ²xvi 2,13, ⁴iii
15, xii 8
11 1¹ iv 15,40 viii 34, ²iii
5,10 b¹, ³v 16, vi 3,
x 16,19, xxi 4
3 1¹ iv 11, vi 4, x 14 b¹
2 1¹ 82, iv 23, ²v 34,36
3 1¹ iv 33, ²i 54,55, ix 16
4 1¹ xi 3, xv 6, ²xi 3, ³viii
25, xi 3
5 1¹ xvi 27
9 1¹ viii 2
11 1¹ iv 20, xi 3 ter, 5, ²vi
13, viii 6, ³vi 14, xvi
4
12 1¹ iii 8, ²vi 13, viii 4,
³vi 13, xiv 5
13 1¹ iii 9, viii 12, ix 22, xii
3, ²iv 11, v 17, x 25,
³ix 23, xvi 19, ⁴iii 10,
ix 20, xii 7, xii 6,
⁵vi 5, xi 4, ⁶iii 7, v
2, x 13, ⁷xii 9,15,
⁸iii 10
4 2 1¹ xiv 1,29, x 6,7, xxi
13, ²xiv 10,11, ³iv
12,52
3 1¹ xii 16, ²xi 17
4 1¹ v 10, xi 3, xiv 16, ⁴xi
3 b¹, xii 13, ⁵i 38,41,
viii 31, xiv 29,33, x 3,
6,5, xxi 13, ⁶v 5,
xiv 10,17, ⁷iii 9,10,
vi 5, xii 6, xiv 16
5 1¹ viii 12,15
6 1¹ vi 12
7 1¹ xxi 12
9 1¹ vi 6, xii 3
10 1¹ iv 12, ²iii 7, iv 11
11 1¹ iv 5, ²v 2, x 13, xi 11,
xxii 14
12 1¹ ix 20, xi 3,4, ²xi 3,
end'g xxiiv 6
5 1¹ iv 43, ²v 20, ³xi 3,
xii 7, ⁴iv 43,54, ix 21,
viii 9, xiv 8
2 1¹ iii 7, xii 12
3 1¹ xvi 1, ²xi 14,17
4 1¹ xii 12
5 1¹ viii 30, xii 11, ²xi
14
6 1¹ xiv 7
8 1¹ xi 14

- TS iv
59¹ ix 22, ix 3,5,6, xvi 26,
2 xiv 8
10¹ iv 7, xi 3, 2 iii 8, viii
26, xi 3, 2 iii 9, 4 iii
8, vi 5, vii 4, 6 xii 8,
end^g xxiiv 6
11¹ xi 17, 2 i 61, xi 16
61¹ xi 14, xi 8 b^{as}, xii 8,
xiv 9, xvi 2, 2 iii 14,
xii 5, 1 xi 3, xii 7,
6 xvi 20 b^{as}
2¹ xiv 8, 2 v 17, 4 iii 13,
iv 38, vi 11, 6 viii 27,
xvi 14, 6 iii 13
3¹ iii 8, 2 viii 9, 3 ix 21,
22, 2 ix 22
4¹ xi 21, v 34, ix 3,4,5,6,
xii 15, xvi 26, 1 iii
12, 2 vi 12 ix 21, xii
8, 4 iii 10 b^{as}, xvi
26
5¹ viii 24, 2 xii 6, 4 iii
10, ix 7, 6 xiii 9
6¹ ix 20, xi 3, xiii 3, xia
1, 12 x 13, 2 iv 20,21,
v 2, vi 13 b^{as}, 2 iii 7,
8, ix 20, xii 7, xiii 9,
xvii 5, 4 iv 11, xi 3,
xii 7 b^{as}, xvi 20, 6 i
59, ix 20, xii 3,7, 6 v
17, x 10, xiv 27, 7 vi
4, xii 7
7¹ viii 8, ix 20, xi 3, xii 8,
2 iii 8, viii 8, xi 5 *tei*,
xvi 13, 4 iv 38, xii 4,
xvi 8, 6 iii 8, xvi 7
9¹ ix 8,20, xi 3, xiv 8
2 xii 7, xvi 5, 4 xii 7
9¹ ix 20, xi 3, xvi 8, 2 iii
7, 2 iii 8,12, viii 32,
xvi 5, 4 i 25, iii 14,
iv 15 b^{as}, v 4 b^{as}, 38,
viii 28, xii 7, xvi
13
71¹ xi 11
2¹ ii 44
3¹ v 20,27
4¹ xiv 15, 2 v 4, xiv 8,
2 xiii 12
5¹ iv 38, v 4, xiv 11, xxi
14, xxiiv 5
6¹ viii 6, ix 2,6
8 xii 7
9¹ xxi 3
10¹ v 21
12¹ iii,10, xi 3 b^{as}, xii 7
ix 52, 2 ix 22
18¹ iv 52, xvi 3, 2 iv 11,
viii 25, 2 viii 33, 4 iii
12, 6 iii 6, iv 11, vi
14, xvi 18, xxiiv 5
14¹ iii 3, 2 iii 12, xi 3, xii,
7, 2 viii 8, xii 7
15¹ ix 20, xi 3, xii,15, xvi
13, 2 iv 40, v 4, 2 iii
7, iv 52, xiv 28, 4 ix
23, xvi 1, 6 iii 10, iv
20 b^{as}, 21, xvi 13,20,
2 iii 12,13, vi 2, xxi,1
- TS v
11¹ ix 20, xi 16, 2 v 18,
4 viii 33, ix 3, xiii 9
b^{as}, xiv 26, xxi 12,
2 xiv 5
2¹ viii 8, 2 v 13, xvi
7, 2 xvi 13, 2 iii 6
3¹ i 61, xi 18, 2 i 61
4¹ xi 13,15, 2 iv 44
5¹ i 61, iv 25, 2 4 i 61,
4 iv 17,23, 6 xiv 16,
xvi 16
6¹ 2 iv 44,45, 4 vi 12,13,
vii 16, ix 1
7¹ vi 2, xii 13, 4 viii 8,
xiv 8
10¹ x 10, xiii 7, xiv 4,
2 2 iv 52, 2 ii 49
11¹ vi 5, ix 7,13,20, xi 16,
2 iii 10, iv 20, vi 9,
18
21¹ vi 21, iv 12, ix 3, xiv 15
2¹ xi 16,17
3¹ i 29, 2 xiv 18, 2 4 iii
5, 4 v 21,24, 2 iv 31,
6 iii 8
4¹ xvi 6
5¹ xvi 13, 2 xii 9, 2 vi
12, 2 xii 8
6¹ vi 12, 2 viii 5,6
7¹ iv 25, xvi 8, xiv 9,
2 xvi 13, xxi 8, 2 ii
30, x 10, xiv 23, 4 iv
25,26, 6 iii 15, xiv 10,
11, xxi 9 xxiiv 4
8¹ xiii 14, 2 xvi 1, 6 xxi
7, 2 xvi 2,13
9¹ xiv 11, 2 xvi 19,
10¹ xvi 27, 6 xvi 8, 7 ix
21
11¹ ix 20, xiv 5,8 b^{as}
12¹ ix 20, 2 xi 3,17
31¹ v 9, 2 xiv 28, 2 vi 12,
4 iv 50, 6 xvi 30 b^{as}
3¹ vi 13, 2 xvi 25
5¹ iv 44,45, 2 viii 10, 2 v
14
6¹ vi 14, 2 x 18, xxiiv 5,
2 vi 14, xiv 13
7¹ iv 42, 2 i 25, iv 11,
33
8¹ xvi 15, 2 xiv 8
11¹ xvi 13, 2 iii 5, vi 14,
2 x 16, xxi 1,2
12¹ v 7, 2 v 38, xi 17
41¹ iv 42, 4 xvi,14
2¹ v 38
3¹ vi 3, xiv 15, 4 xxi 9
4¹ vi 4, 4 iv 12, xxi 16
6¹ viii 29
7¹ iv 29, 7 xxi,9
8¹ i 31, iv 52, xiv 2,22
9¹ iv 11, 4 xi 5,6
10¹ xvi,14, 2 xvi 13
11¹ xxi 7
12¹ vi 5,14, 2 v 6
51¹ v 21, 7 xvi 16
2¹ v 17, 6 v 33, xxi 2
3¹ ix 21, 2 ix 18, xvi 2,
xx 2,3, xxiiv 5
- TS v
54¹ ix 25 b^{as}, ix 10, 2 iv
31, 4 iv 38, ix 16
5¹ xi 8,9, 2 viii 5,16, xvi
26, 2 xxi 2, 4 x 10,
17 b^{as}, xvi 13, 2 v 5
6¹ iv 44, 2 iv 37
7¹ iv 33, 2 viii 30, xi 5,
4 viii 23
8¹ x 18, 2 xiv 5
9¹ iv 11, xvi 26, xxi 10,
2 xiv 3,5, 2 i 22, ii 25
b^{as}, 48, xii 2, xiv 23,
xvi 26, 2 iii 16, xi
16,17
10¹ iv 32
11¹ iv 39, xvi 26, xxi 8
12¹ xvi 19
15¹ iv 39, viii 13, xiii 12
16¹ viii 17
18¹ iv 28, iv 2
19¹ viii 17, xiv 23
20¹ iii 2
21¹ x 4
24¹ iv 12
61¹ iv 11, ix 20, 2 ii 47, iii
12, ix 15,20 b^{as}, x 19,
21, xi 1, xvi 1,2, xxi
2, 2 iii 15, viii 2, iii
8, xi 3,5, 2 vi 10
2¹ xvi 18
4¹ iv 25 b^{as}, xii 8, xvi 19,
4 xvi 27
5¹ ii 49, ix 19,21, xiii 12,
xvi 24,27
6¹ v 22, 2 xi 17, 2 xvi
26, 4 v 6
7¹ xvi 8
8¹ xvi 2, 2 vi 12,13, 2 vi
13, xiv 4, 2 iv 52, 6 iv
11
9¹ viii 3, 2 xii 3
12¹ iv 15
14¹ x 14
15¹ x 6,
21¹ i 39, iv 39,48 b^{as}, xxi
8
23¹ vi 12
72¹ viii 2, 4 viii 8, xi 17,
4 iii 10, xiv,11, 4 6 iv,
7
3¹ vi,12, xi 13, xiv 9,17,
2 xi 25, iv 44, vi 14
4¹ x 12, xx 2,8, 2 iii 3,
4 xvi 22
5¹ viii 2, 2 iii 7
6¹ viii 8, xii 14, 2 vi 7
7¹ xi 16, 2 iv 11, 2 iii 15,
8¹ xi 17
9¹ iv 7, ix 21,22,24, x 19,
xi 9,16, xvi 1,6, xix,
1, xx 2,
10¹ xvi 1
11¹ v 14, xiv,16, xxi,16,
12¹ i 22, v,37, x 14
14¹ vi 7,
17 iii,7
20¹ viii 13, x 12, xvi 8
28¹ xiv 2,10, xvi,7,14,16
26¹ ix,4, xx 8

- TS vi
 1 1 ¹אֲנִי 21, ²יִצְחָק 17, אֲנִי 11,
³אֲנִי 13, ⁴וְיָמִי 34,
⁵אֲנִי 3
 3 ¹יִצְחָק 11, 24, 38, 42 *bas*, וְיִצְחָק 7,
 וְיָמִי 16, וְיָמִי 6, ²אֲנִי 11
 6, ³יִצְחָק 34, אֲנִי 5, ⁴יִצְחָק
 35, וְיָמִי 11
 4 ¹וְיָמִי 12, ²אֲנִי 4, וְיָמִי 14
 5 ¹יִצְחָק 52, וְיָמִי 6, אֲנִי 3, וְיָמִי
 7, וְיָמִי 15, ²וְיָמִי 7, וְיָמִי
 6, ³וְיָמִי 6
 6 ¹אֲנִי 48, אֲנִי 1, 5, ²יִצְחָק 42,
 וְיָמִי 31, ³אֲנִי 22, ⁴יִצְחָק
 28, וְיָמִי 9, 12, אֲנִי 7
 7 ¹וְיָמִי 9, ²יִצְחָק 59
 8 ¹יִצְחָק 44, 45
 9 ¹אֲנִי 58, וְיָמִי 23, אֲנִי 9, אֲנִי 19,
 אֲנִי 7, 8, אֲנִי 10, וְיָמִי 13,
 אֲנִי 19
 10 ¹יִצְחָק 2, אֲנִי 16 *bas*, וְיָמִי 12,
 אֲנִי 6, ²אֲנִי 17
 11 ¹וְיָמִי 16, ²אֲנִי 17
 2 1 ¹וְיָמִי 7, וְיָמִי 4, ²יִצְחָק 12, 33,
³אֲנִי 22
 2 ¹וְיָמִי 8
 3 ¹יִצְחָק 7, ²וְיָמִי 8, ³יִצְחָק 18
 4 ¹אֲנִי 25, אֲנִי 10, 17, אֲנִי 5, 6,
²וְיָמִי 17
 6 ¹אֲנִי 21, ²וְיָמִי 6, אֲנִי 9
 8 ¹יִצְחָק 11, ²אֲנִי 16
 9 ¹יִצְחָק 11 *bas*, ²יִצְחָק 33, ³יִצְחָק
 10, וְיָמִי 8, אֲנִי 2 *bas*, אֲנִי 8
 11 ¹יִצְחָק 59, יִצְחָק 11, ²יִצְחָק 5, 11 *bas*,
 וְיָמִי 9, וְיָמִי 14, ³אֲנִי 44, יִצְחָק
 11, וְיָמִי 11, וְיָמִי 16, אֲנִי 8
 3 1 ¹יִצְחָק 6, אֲנִי 22, ²אֲנִי 30, וְיָמִי
 32, 38
 2 ¹אֲנִי 14, אֲנִי 22, ²יִצְחָק 7
 3 ¹יִצְחָק 38, 39, 40, אֲנִי 12,
²אֲנִי 15
 4 ¹אֲנִי 8, ²אֲנִי 5
 5 ¹יִצְחָק 52
 6 ¹אֲנִי 8, וְיָמִי 15
 7 ¹אֲנִי 5
 9 ¹וְיָמִי 14, ²אֲנִי 16, ³וְיָמִי 7,
⁴יִצְחָק 12
 10 ¹וְיָמִי 8, ²אֲנִי 20, ³אֲנִי 6,
⁴וְיָמִי 10
 11 ¹יִצְחָק 11, 24, ²אֲנִי 2
 4 1 ¹יִצְחָק 14, אֲנִי 14
 2 ¹אֲנִי 2
 3 ¹אֲנִי 6, 14, ²וְיָמִי 23, ³אֲנִי 8,
 אֲנִי 8
 4 ¹אֲנִי 29, ²אֲנִי 8, אֲנִי 29
bas
 5 ¹אֲנִי 16, אֲנִי 17, ²אֲנִי 29,
³אֲנִי 29
 6 ¹וְיָמִי 10, אֲנִי 20, אֲנִי 29,
²וְיָמִי 10
 7 ¹אֲנִי 48, יִצְחָק 40, וְיָמִי 23, אֲנִי 1,
²וְיָמִי 12 *bas*, וְיָמִי 2
- TS vi
 4 8 ¹אֲנִי 29
 9 ¹וְיָמִי 23, אֲנִי 17
 10 ¹יִצְחָק 40, וְיָמִי 13, אֲנִי 28,
 וְיָמִי 3, ²וְיָמִי 35, ³יִצְחָק
 11, end'g וְיָמִי 35,
 אֲנִי 6
 11 ¹יִצְחָק 11, וְיָמִי 10
 5 1 ¹אֲנִי 32
 2 ¹אֲנִי 6
 3 ¹אֲנִי 24, ²אֲנִי 23, אֲנִי 12
 5 ¹וְיָמִי 2
 6 ¹אֲנִי 31
 8 ¹אֲנִי 21, יִצְחָק 7, ²אֲנִי 4, 58, וְיָמִי
 27, אֲנִי 8, אֲנִי 13, ³אֲנִי
 59, וְיָמִי 15, יִצְחָק 53, וְיָמִי
 8, end'g אֲנִי 6
 10 ¹אֲנִי 9
 11 ¹וְיָמִי 16, ²אֲנִי 10, אֲנִי 17,
 וְיָמִי 7
 6 1 ¹אֲנִי 9
 2 ¹אֲנִי 16, ²אֲנִי 54
 3 ¹וְיָמִי 30, אֲנִי 14, ²וְיָמִי
 33, ³יִצְחָק 33
 4 ¹וְיָמִי 16, ²אֲנִי 13, ³אֲנִי 30,
 59, יִצְחָק 35, אֲנִי 10, ⁴אֲנִי 14
 5 ¹אֲנִי 10, אֲנִי 10, ²אֲנִי 20
 7 ¹אֲנִי 12
 8 ¹יִצְחָק 28
 10 ¹אֲנִי 10, אֲנִי 29
 11 ¹יִצְחָק 32, אֲנִי 12, 13, אֲנִי 4,
²יִצְחָק 11, וְיָמִי 11, ³אֲנִי 6
- TS vii
 1 1 ¹אֲנִי 1, ²אֲנִי 18, 31, אֲנִי 13
 3 ¹יִצְחָק 14, ²יִצְחָק 20
 4 ¹יִצְחָק 11, אֲנִי 2, אֲנִי 11
 5 ¹יִצְחָק 14, ²יִצְחָק 22, ³אֲנִי 10,
 וְיָמִי 11, אֲנִי 31, ⁴אֲנִי 7
 6 ¹אֲנִי 24, אֲנִי 7, אֲנִי 5,
²אֲנִי 29, ³אֲנִי 6,
⁴אֲנִי 12, ⁵וְיָמִי 15, וְיָמִי 9,
 וְיָמִי 5, וְיָמִי 12, אֲנִי 2, 21,
 26, ⁶אֲנִי 17
 7 ¹אֲנִי 9
 8 ¹יִצְחָק 12, אֲנִי 17, אֲנִי 5, 6
 9 אֲנִי 21
 12 אֲנִי 10
 19 ¹יִצְחָק 12, וְיָמִי 12, וְיָמִי 5, וְיָמִי
 14, אֲנִי 22, ²יִצְחָק 14,
 אֲנִי 22
 2 1 ¹יִצְחָק 52, ²אֲנִי 24, ³אֲנִי 10
 2 ¹אֲנִי 25
 4 ¹אֲנִי 9
 5 ¹וְיָמִי 4
 6 ¹אֲנִי 31, ²יִצְחָק 54
 7 ¹וְיָמִי 10, אֲנִי 16
 8 ¹וְיָמִי 6, וְיָמִי 13
 9 ¹יִצְחָק 11
 10 ¹אֲנִי 13, אֲנִי 29, ²יִצְחָק 2,
 וְיָמִי 12, ³אֲנִי 10
 13 אֲנִי 25, אֲנִי 14
 15 אֲנִי 44, וְיָמִי 2, וְיָמִי 2
- TS vii
 2 17 אֲנִי 25 *bas*
 3 1 ¹אֲנִי 12, ²אֲנִי 15
 2 ¹אֲנִי 20
 4 ¹יִצְחָק 21
 5 ¹וְיָמִי 13
 8 ¹אֲנִי 10
 9 ¹וְיָמִי 13
 10 ¹יִצְחָק 11, אֲנִי 16
 12 ¹יִצְחָק 33, אֲנִי 5, אֲנִי 9, 12,
 אֲנִי 5
 13 אֲנִי 17, אֲנִי 15
 14 אֲנִי 30, אֲנִי 9, אֲנִי 1
 15 אֲנִי 14
 16 ¹אֲנִי 22, וְיָמִי 7 *bas*, אֲנִי 14, ²אֲנִי
 7, אֲנִי 30
 17 אֲנִי 14, אֲנִי 30
 18 אֲנִי 12, וְיָמִי 12
 4 2 ¹יִצְחָק 32, וְיָמִי 13, אֲנִי 18
 3 ¹אֲנִי 14, ²אֲנִי 7, ³יִצְחָק 6
 4 ¹יִצְחָק 54, ²יִצְחָק 52
 5 ¹יִצְחָק 51, וְיָמִי 13, ²וְיָמִי 2
 7 ¹אֲנִי 1
 8 ¹יִצְחָק 52, ²אֲנִי 4, ³אֲנִי 10
 9 אֲנִי 13
 10 ¹יִצְחָק 13, ²וְיָמִי 8
 11 ¹יִצְחָק 2, 13, ²יִצְחָק 12, ³יִצְחָק
 53
 13 וְיָמִי 7, אֲנִי 16, אֲנִי 16
 15 וְיָמִי 10, אֲנִי 17, אֲנִי 20
 17 ¹אֲנִי 6
 19 ¹אֲנִי 10, אֲנִי 17, אֲנִי 18,
²אֲנִי 12, אֲנִי 2, ³אֲנִי 13
 20 וְיָמִי 8, אֲנִי 6, 7, וְיָמִי 12, 15,
 אֲנִי 8, אֲנִי 18, אֲנִי 7
 21 אֲנִי 12
 5 1 ¹אֲנִי 14, ²יִצְחָק 11, וְיָמִי 14,
 וְיָמִי 29, ³אֲנִי 12
 2 ¹אֲנִי 47, וְיָמִי 8, אֲנִי 14, אֲנִי 19,
 אֲנִי 27, ²יִצְחָק 12, אֲנִי 17,
 אֲנִי 12, אֲנִי 5
 3 ¹יִצְחָק 11, אֲנִי 12, 17, ²יִצְחָק
 11
 5 ¹אֲנִי 10, ²אֲנִי 4
 6 ¹יִצְחָק 26, ²יִצְחָק 42, ³אֲנִי
 14
 7 ¹יִצְחָק 42, 52, אֲנִי 17, ²אֲנִי 8,
 אֲנִי 13
 8 ¹אֲנִי 6, ²יִצְחָק 19
 9 ¹אֲנִי 16, אֲנִי 4, ²אֲנִי 12,
³וְיָמִי 16, ⁴יִצְחָק 10, אֲנִי 8
 10 וְיָמִי 16
 11 ¹אֲנִי 2, 5, אֲנִי 5, ²אֲנִי 4
 12 ¹אֲנִי 13, ²אֲנִי 13, אֲנִי 23,
 אֲנִי 10
 14 אֲנִי 8
 15 ¹אֲנִי 8, אֲנִי 14
 19 ¹אֲנִי 22
 20 אֲנִי 16
 22 אֲנִי 29
 24 אֲנִי 20, אֲנִי 13
 25 ¹אֲנִי 13, ²אֲנִי 1

- ad yā*, iii 5,8 (instead of *aghu*)
ad yā 'n n, xii 7
ad yā, xiii 20
ad hā u n t 'u p a t u n, ix 22
ad hā ro shā, ci 39,43
ad hā stut, ci 28
ad hā, iii 9
ad hā yā, xii 7
ad hā, i 15
ad hā, xv 5 - ci 11,25,28, xvi 19, xvii 1 and *ad hā* *kyā*
ad hā karāna, ci 59
ad hā, ci 12, ii 1, iii 1, iv 1,5, etc
ad hā ca āhā, xxi 6 - xx 3
ad hā gāma, ci 1
ad hā ā v a n e, iv 11
ad hā, iii 7
ad hā yāna, ci 1 xiv 4,5,28
ad hā yā dha, ii 28 - ci 25,28, xi 19, xxi 1
ad hā yā, ci 161, x 15, xii 1, xiii 3,15, xiv 4, xix 5, xxi 2, and endings of chapters
ad hā yā, ci 34, xvii 8, xxiv 5
ad hā vāra, xi 18
ad hā vāra m v i ś v a t a h, viii 32
ad hā vārya, xii 8
ad v ā n, v 21
ad ā t ā, iii 12
ad ā hā k r i t ā, c vii 15
ad ā n t ā h, viii 8
ad ā n t ā r ā, i 41,44, xxi 16 - ci 1, ii 1, iii 1 etc, iv 53, x 12, xvi 13
ad ā n t ā d ā t ā, xvi 5
ad ā p e k ś h a, c xiv 18
ad ā m e v ā h, xi 17
ad ā r t h ā, ci x 23
ad ā r t h ā k ā, ci v 23, - viii 13, ix 8,23, xiv 15, xxi 5
ad ā v a g r a h ā, ci iii 8,10,12-4
ad ā v a s t h ā, c xiv 22
ad ā d e j ā, ii 20 - ci 21
ad ā d y ā d ā t ā, viii 10
-ā n ā n, vi 14
ad ā m ā k ā, c xiii 17
ad ā r ś h ā, ci x 22
ad ā h y ā n t ā, viii 13 - c viii 8
ad ā y ā, c vi 14
ad ā h ā, ci 4,21, ii 20, iv 23, v 33, ix 6, x 11, xii 3 xiv 22 xvi 29
ad ā s t r t ā h, xi 4
ad ā, vii 12
ad ā, xi 5,7
ad ā kar ś h ā n ā, c xiv 28
ad ā car ā n ā, ci v 23
ad ā t t ā n ā, xiv 24, xxi 12
ad ā d ā t ā, i 39 45,46, iii 15, iv 43 vi 4, viii 9 x 12,16, xi 9,10, xiv 29, xvi 8, xviii 2, xx 2 xxi 10 - c x 10, xii 6, xxi 10, xxi 16 17
ad ā d ā t ā t ā r ā, ci 44
ad ā m ā s i k ā, ii 30, v 26-8, 31, x 11, xv 1,6, xvi 14 - ci 1, ii 19,30 v 29-31, xiv 23, xv 7-9, xvi 1 (*tā*) and *sa n ā n*, *ad ā n ā s i k ā*
ad ā p ā d ā, c xiv 6
ad ā p ā p ā t h ā, ci v 23, xiv 4
ad ā p ā n ā n ā, ci 21,59, iv 23 (*tā*), v 26,35, viii 18, xvi 2
ad ā p ā l ā d ā h ā, xxi 7
ad ā p ā d ā n ā, ii 8, xxi 2 - ci 9,10
ad ā r o d ā h ā, ci 2, xiv 5,28, xxi 12
ad ā v ā r t ā n ā, ci x 9, x 14, xii 16
ad ā v ā k ā, ci 61, iii 9, iv 25, 26,48,52, ix 20, xi 3, xvi 6v, xviii 3v
ad ā v ā t h ā, ci v 40, viii 23, xvi 13
ad ā s ā r ā, ci 21,57,59, iv 52
ad ā s ā r t ā, c viii 16
ad ā s ā r ā n ā, c xiii 16
ad ā s ā v ā, i 18,34, ii 19 30, x 3, xvi 1,3, xxi 6, xxi 15 - ci 1,60, ii 25,33, viii 15, xvi 2-15,17-23,25-31, xvii 5
ad ā, iii 7
ad ā k ā r ā, iv 52
ad ā s t m ā n ā, iii 15
ad ā r n ā h, xi 17
ad ā r t e, iv 11
ad ā k ā, i 26
ad ā k ā r t ā, ci 1 (*tā*), vi 13, viii 28 (*tā*)
ad ā k ā r ā, i 53
ad ā, i 55 (*vā*), ii 17,40,43, 48 iv 3, vii 16, viii 1, x 5, xxi 14,15 xxi 15 - ci 21 etc and *ing y ā n ā*
ad ā t ā h, viii 10,32
ad ā h ā p ā t ā, ci v 23, viii 18, xii 3
ad ā t ā h, c xix 3
ad ā m ā h, xi 13
ad ā r ā, v 40, ix 16, xxi 17 - c x 3 etc and *ad ā n ā*, *ad ā*
ad ā
ad ā r ā s y ā m, xii 7
ad ā r ā, iv 20
ad ā r ā t m ā n ā, ci 41
ad ā r ā h ā, xiv 30
ad ā s t h ā, i 8, v 28, xxi 7 - ci 1, xiv 28
ad ā d ā t ā, xvi 5 - c viii 10
ad ā y ā, i 58 - c viii 4, x 13,18
ad ā h ā h, xi 10
ad ā n ā y ā, xii 7
ad ā n ā s h ā, vi 17
ad ā y ā, ii 11,33, xxi 14 - ci 19 ii 2,19 ix 1, xiv 5, xv 9
ad ā y ā h, viii 16
ad ā y ā r ā t ā h, xix 1
ad ā y ā v ā s t h ā, c xiv 5
ad ā y ā v ā, xxi 2
ad ā y ā t h ā, ci 42 etc
ad ā y ā n ā, viii 16
ad ā y ā d ā h ā, viii 16
ad ā y ā n ā n ā y ā, ci 49, ii 7
ad ā y ā, ci 1, xiv 15, xvi 23 and *ad ā y ā n ā n ā*, *ad ā s ā r ā n ā*
ad ā v ā r t ā, ci 3
ad ā v ā s ā r g ā, xxi 10
ad ā k ā r ś h ā k ā, ci 34, x 17
ad ā v ā c y ā, c xii 14, xxi 10
ad ā d e j ā, i 58 - ci v 3,16, vi 3, vii 3,6, viii 12 ix 22, xi 4,6,11, xii 6, xiv 4, xxi 5
ad ā d e j ā k ā, xxi 5 - ci 52 ii 13,18, v 30 vi 3, xi 4, xiv 6,8,20, xv 4, xvi 3
ad ā h ā, xi 6
ad ā r ā, ci 21, xi 1, xv 7,9
ad ā r ā, xi 12
ad ā r ā g r ā h ā, c xvi 29
ad ā v ā d ā, ci 13, iv 2, vi 5 viii 4, xii 8, xvi 11
ad ā v ā d ā k ā, c xiv 5,6
ad ā s ā, ci 14
ad ā s ā h ā, viii 24
ad ā, viii 12
ad ā m ā p ā t ā, xi 8
ad ā, i 26,43,51,52, iv 4,51 vii 5 viii 12, xii 7, xiv 30, xv 8, xvi 3,15 xxi 3, xxi 5,14 xxi 4
ad ā d ā d ā h ā m ā, xii 7
ad ā d ā h ā n ā, c x iii 3
ad ā p ā m ā, xii 7
ad ā p ā r v ā, xxi 2
ad ā p r ā, i 54 ix 16 - ci v 17
ad ā p e k ś h ā, ci 35, iv 2, ix 22 (*k ś h ā t ā*), xiv 18, xv 9 xxi 5,11 and *ad ā p ā*, *ad ā p ā*
ad ā p ā e t ā, ix 22
ad ā p r ā g r ā h ā, xv 6

- abara*, iv 40, ix 20, xvi 14
 16 (*anu*-)
akhyā, i 16, 27 -c i 16, 17, 19-
 23, 27, 28
agama, i 23, xiv 5 -c i 24,
 53, 60, v 4-8, 32, 33, 40, 41,
 ix 16, xiv 5-11, 23, xv 3-
 5, xvi 2-31, xxi 12
Agniṣṭya, see p 430
Agniṣṭya, see p 430
ai, ci 115, iv 23
u ca, ix 22
acarya xiv 6 -c i 47, ix 4,
 x 21, 22, xiv 4, xv 8, xviii
 13, xxi 18, and see p
 430
atnarah, xiii 12
atāṣṭi, xvi 13
at, xiv 8
-itmakā, c xiv 28, xxi 1
Atiyea, c intr, v 1, and see
 p 430
ada, i 41, 46, 52, 53, 55, ii 26,
 47 iii 1, xvi 29, xxi 4,
 xxi 15, (=etc), v 40,
 xxi 11 xxi 14
aditah, i 25 -c i 47, xxi
 10
adeṣa, ci 52, iii 8, ix 7, x 19,
 xii 16 and *anud-*
ādeṣa, ci 133
adya, i 7
adyudātta, vi 14 -c viii 8
 and *and*
adhikya c xiv 3
ān, iii 15
-ān mahr, iv 34
anantarya, ci 1, ii 1
anukūlya, ci 46
anundakya, ii 52 xvii 1 -
 c xvii 3, 4 and *sān*
anupada, c xiv 6
anupurva, i 1, 10, ii 44, xxi
 12, xxi 13 -c i 1, xvii 4
anumānaka, ci 9
r āp, c viii 11-15, ix 17, x
 2, 4-8, 10, 11, xii 7, 8, xiv
 3, 21, +*pra*, ii 32 34, 35,
 ix 13, x 13, xi 4, xii 16,
 xvi 29 and *prāpāna*,
prāpta, *prāpti*, *atīvyāpti*
apah, iv 25, xi 5, 8
āpatti, ci 37, 51, v 24, 31, 35,
 viii 13, xii 3, xiv 12
āpādaka, c v 35
ā pushd, x 13
-ā prśhat, iv 15
āpo hi, vi 2
ābhāsāt, ci 25
ābhāh, vi 5
āy, ix 14
āyājishthah, ix 22
ayan, v 21
ayama, xxi 9
ayuh, vi 5, 13
ayo, xii 8
ar, x 9
arambha, ci 60, ii 20, 23 v
 10, 41 vi 3, viii 8, 16, 24,
 ix 13, 21, x 22, xii 1, 6,
 xiii 10, xiv 22, 24, xvi 4, 6,
 18, x 10, xxi 1
arambhana, c v 1, xiv 3
arvitha, iii 10
aropaniya, c xiv 9, 9 (*tva*)
orthaka, ci 59
ar dhruvan v 21
asā, ix 21, x 13 -c ix 23,
 xxi 2
āv, ix 15
āvah, viii 9
āvah, viii 24
avinnah, xi 15
avrt viii 11
āvrtti, ci 31v
āṣṭh, v 10
āgraya, c xxi 2
āgrayana, ci 1
āgrayatva, ci 1, viii 18
r ds + adhi, c xiv 4
āsate ye, xi 16
asanna, i 25
astam, iv 52
āhuti, iii 7, iv 15
āhuraṣa, xxi 14
r e + adhi xxi 5 -c xxi
 7, xxi 6v, +*prati*, ci 30,
 42, ii 41, iv 11 v 7, xviii
 1, xix 3, x 10 xxi 16
 and *adhyaṇa*, *adhyeta*,
vyaveta, etc
ākāra, ii 28
r ing + ut, xvii 8
āṅgya, i 48 -c i 49, iii 8, iv
 10
āṅgyānta, iv 10, viii 13 (*an*)
 -c viii 13, 13 (*tva*)
ādah, viii 24
ādāvan, ix 21
ātaratra, c viii 14
ātaratha c v 12
āti, i 15, 29, 30, 46, 47 ii 3, iii
 7, iv 3, 10, v 10, 15, 31, xii
 4, 14, xiv 33, xvi 12, 30,
 xvii 1-4, 7, 8, xviii 2, x 2,
 8, xxi 5-10, 13, xxi 2,
 16, 19, 20 xiv 2, 3, 6
atpau iv 4 viii 12, ix 20
(an) -c i 15 (*tva*), ix 2
(an), 21 (*tva*), 23 (*do*)
atvat, ci 7 etc
attham, ci 2
ity evam v 18
ad agne, v 17
adam ci 146, ii 51
adu v 17
adannam ci 43, ix 11
andra, viii 2
andrah viii 8, xi 9
andrā, iii 3
andrya, c xxi 15 (*vishaya*)
andrya, iii 5
andro me, ix 22
amam nah, v 17
ame, iv 24
iyam eva sa ya, xi 3
avati, iv 22
ava xvii 8
avarna, ii 22, x 4, 15, xxi 1
r ish ich, c v 1, viii 15
 + *abhi*, ci 9 and *ishita*,
ishit
ashita ci 46, v 37, 41, viii
 22, x 21, xiv 3, 9, 13, 26, 33,
 xv 2, 7, 9, xvi 16, 24, xvii
 7, xviii 5, 7, xix 3 and
am
ishatak, iv 44
ishita, iii 6
ishit, iv 52
ihā, ix 22
ikāra iv 8 ix 20, xvi 14
r iksh + vi, c intr, +*apa*
 c v 24 (*anupreksya*) and
apeksa
idenyan, ix 22
im v 12
iyuh, vi 5
r rr + sam, ci 2
irayathā, iii 10
ishat, ii 15
u, xxi 14
u, vi 2
ukara, ii 29, viii 21 ix 16,
 x 15, 22 xxi 1
ukta, i 61, xxi 19 -c iv 23
 (*tva*)
ukh, ci 61, ii 23, iii 7, viii
 13, x 9, 12
uktha, iii 2
ukshata, iii 10
ukhya, ix 20 xi 3 -c i 61
 ix 23 (*tva*)
Ukhyā, see p 430
ugana, viii 12
r uc ucita c xvi 7
ucca, i 38 (*uccah*), xxi 20 -
 ci 18 xvii 4, x 2
ucca, v 8
uccarana, ci 1, iv 11, x 23,
 xvi 13, xxi 5, xxi 9 and
am
uccāhikara, xxi 9

- uccastara*, 141
uchvāsa, c v 1
ut, iii 15, v 14, ix 24, xvi 21
uttama, i 11, ii 30, v 31, viii 2, xiv 11, 24 xvii 1, xxi 12 and *anutt-*
uttama, iv 11
Uttamottarīya, see p 430
uttara, i 16, 20, 27, 30, ii 17, 29, iii 1, xiv 5, xvi 4 - c ii 25, iii 1 etc
uttaratra, c xii 11, 12
uttaradanta, c ii 43
uttarapada, c iii 1
uttare, iv 11
uttaroshtha, c ii 39
utpatti, ii 1, xiii 1, 3 - c ix 22, x 12
utpala, c v 28
udaka, c ii 1 xxi 1
udaya, ii 47
udayan, ix 21
udatta, i 38, 41, 42 (-sama), 46 (sama), v 13, x 10, 16, xii 5, 9, 10, xiv 29, 31, xvi 30, xviii 2, 6, xix 1, xx 1, 3, 7, xxi 11, xxiv 5 - c xxi 9, xxiii 16, 17
udattatara, c i 41
udattavanti, x 10
udattarūti, xxi 10
udāharana, c i 18, 21, 22, 42, 44, ii 25, 50, iii 2, 7, iv 54, v 3, 26, 41 etc and *pīa*
tyud-
upa, i 15
upa, xi 3, iv 24, 42
upadeśa, c i 1, ii 20, xx 1
upadhānīya, i 18, xiv 5 - c ii 44
upapatti, c iutr, ii 23, 47, iv 52 and *anup-*
upabandha, i 59 - c iv 23
upabdhmant, xxiii 5, 9
upari, c ii 47, iv 45
uparīkama, c i 46, x 6, xxiii 5
uparibhāga, c ii 37, 41
uparishat, c i 40, ii 18, 44,
uparishthāy, c xxi 1
upalakshakatva, c iv 23, viii 34
upalakshana, c i 23, 28, viii 34, ix 24, xvi 25
upalakṣhāḥ, xxiii 4, 13 - c ii 1 xxi 1, xxiii 8, 9 and *anup*
upakambha, c i 1, 18
upaśleṣa, c ii 31
upasamhāra, ii 24, 31 - c ii 19, 24, 25, xxiii 19
upasamhrtatara, ii 14, 16, 18 and *atyupasamhrtatara*
upāsarga, i 15, vi 4, x 9, xiv 8 - c vi 9 12
upasthā, iv 21
upaṅgu, xxiii 5, 6
upāṅgu, xvi 29
upanga, c xxiv 6
upadama, c i 25, ii 1, iv 40, viii 6, xvi 29, xiii 3 and *bahup*
upottama, xi 3
upayamaanam, vii 3
ubha, iv 47, x 1
ubhayatah, c x 10, 11
ubhayatra, c ix 21
ubhayathā, c ii 12, 23
ubhabhāyam, iv 52
ubhā, iv 11
uras, ii 2, 3, xiii 10
urva, vii 2
uruta, xxi 10
urvi, iv 20
ulbanam, xii 12
uvarna, ii 24, x 5
uṣmasi, iii 13
uḥyamanaḥ, vii 6
ū, iii 14, vi 2
ukura, iv 5, 52 (am), ix 20, xvi 14
udhvam, ix 22
unyoḥ, xiii 10
ubhava, x 17, xx 5
urdhva, c x 12
urdhvān, vi 14
ūrdhve, iv 11
ūshmatva, c i 13
ushman, i 9, 12, ii 44, ix 1, 2, 5, xii 2, xiv 9, 12, 16, 18, xv 1, 4, xvii 4, xxi 9, 15 - c i 1 etc and *anushma*
vant
uḥanīya, c i 59
rakara, i 31, ii 18, v 9, vi 8, x 8, xii 6 - c i 33, xxi 15
rksamā, iii 5
rksame, iv 11
rgvīnāma, xxi 12
re, c iv 20, 21, xi 3
rjishā, xvi 18
rnn, xiii 14
rtā, iii 2
rtu, vi 7 ix 22
rtun, vi 11
rdhymā, iii 10
rvarna, c xiv 28
reshabhah, xi 16
rshi, c xi 18, xviii 7
rshinān putrah, xi 16
eka, iv 51 x 1, (aka) i 47, ii 19, 27, 47, v 30, 39, viii 19, ix 5, xi 19, xiii 3, xiv 3, 25, 33, xv 2, 6, xviii 1 xiv 3, xvi 13
ekatu, c ii 7
ekadeśa, c ii 23 iv 52 xii 15 and *paduk-*
ekapada, xv 4 - c iv 11, v 9, xiii 6, xv 7, xxi 13, xxiiv 4
ekapramabhuva, v 1
ekabandha, c xvi 29
chām, v 18
ekamuttra, xxi 13
chayā, v 19
chavacana, c i 23, ii 35, iv 2 xiv 22
chavanai, i 54
ekavīṇī, xxi 12
chayūti, c xv 9
ekasvara, c xv 7, 9
chudāśasah, xi 16
ekadeśa, c i 4, x 10, 12
ekantā, ii 25
ekara, ii 15, 23, iv 8, 40, ix 11, x 4, 6, xi 1
eksharāna, c xiv 15
ekabdhāva, -bhūta, c i 1, x 10
ekāṭhā, c i 11, xxi 11
enā, xii 12
eta (pron) iv 20, 25, 48, v 24, viii 6, x 23, xxi 14, 15, xxiv 5 - c iv 4
etana, x 14
etavanti, c i 1, 15, ii 47, iv 23 etc
ete, iv 44
enani, vii 8
enam abhā, iv 42
enā, v 17
ene, iv 11
ephi, i 19
eman, x 14
eva, ix 5, xiv 3, xix 4, xx 2, xxi 6, xxiv 5
eva, iii 6, iv 44, *evārāve*
nā, iv 24, *evā 'smīn*, v 21, *evō 'ttare*, iv 11
evah, x 14
evalāra, c xix 4
evam, xvii 8 xxiv 4
eshah, v 15, xi 16, xiv 8
eshatah, viii 8, 18, x 14
dhāra, ii 26, ix 14, x 6, xvi 24
dhikshavi, iv 12

ai ayan, v 21

okūa, u 13, iv 6, ix 7, 12, x 5, 7, 22, xi 1 xviii 1

omkara, c 1

otva, c 151, viii 9, 16, 19, 21, ix 7, 8 xi 5, xvi 29

odman, x 14

one, vii 10

oshadh i, iii 7

oshadh i h, v 17

oshtha, u 12 (hamu), 14, 21, 24 39 -c u 25, xvii 2

and adhavo, uttaro-

oshtha, x 14

oshthumta, u 43

oshthya cii 25

aukara u 26 ix 15, x 7

ha (h), viii 23, ix 4

ka (pion), xviii 2 (oit), ke-
ci, c 157, viii 15, xi 1, 3, 9,
xi 3, xiii 13, xiv 4 5, 11,
15, xv 9, xvi 2, 12, xviii 17

ka h, viii 9

kakara, v 32 viii 31

kakui, viii 4

kakshvān ix 21

kathinata, cxxii 9

kantha, u 2, 3, 4, 46, xiii 10

-c u 47, xvii 10, xviii 2,

17v (-mulya)

kantikota, c 159, 59 (-tva)

iii 8, iv 41

kantikota, c 14, 59, vi 3, 5,

viii 16

kanna, xii 9

r kañh, c 11, 53, u 3, 4, 7, v

28, xi 3, xv 9, xviii 3,

xviii 17

kathana, c iv 23, v 26, xx 7,

xviii 17

kānīshūhika, c xviii 17

kanenike, iv 11

kanayā, xvi 13

kupulan, vi 14

kann, vi 2

r kump + pra, c xix 3

kampu, c xix 3, 5

r kar, u 4 -c 161 v 3, 35,

etc., karyu, c u 14 etc.,

karaniya, c xiii 12, + a

dhi, c 11, viii 5, vii 9, xiv

14, xxi 6, adhikṛta, c u

1, iv 1, etc. and adhi-

kṛta etc., karyu, anadhi-

kṛtva, prakṛta, vikṛta

etc., vāṛta

karana, u 27 32, 34, 45, xxi

2, 6 (vat) -c u 20 etc.,

xviii 2, xxi 5

karanu, c xxi 15

kar-o, viii 30

karna, c iv 52, xviii 17 (mā-
lrya)

karṇakā, iii 5

karṇitva, c u 2

karṇatva, c u 2

karṇadharaya, c x 6

karman, c xxi 14, xvii 3

karvini, c xvi 15

1 karsh + amu, c u 51, viii

34 xxi 18, + a, c 1 22, 43,

ii 17, vii 6, 7, viii 4, 15, ix

4, 20, etc., + samu, c u 15,

24 27, iv 23, xi 3 and

karṣṭa, anukarṣhana, an-

vaḥkarṣhaka, akarṣhaka,

sannikarṣha

r kalp xiv 28, + va, c 1 21

kalpayaṇi, iv 15

kalpayaṇi, xii 12

kavarga, u 35 -c u 44

Kavyapa cxxiv 6 (goti a)

kakakṣhi, c iv 21 (vat)

kana, xii 9

kanda, c 161, iii 9, ix 20

Kandamāyana, see p 430

kanacara, c u 7

kara, i 16, xxi 4

karana, c u 1, xvi 26, xxi

3, 19

karya, c 155, 60 (sva-), u 13,

iv 3, 7, 11, v 1, viii 13, 15

ix 7, 24 (sva-), xiv 5, xvi

2, xix 5 (anu), xxi 2

karyabhḍy, c 1 25, 55, 58, 61

iii 1, iv 23 (tva), xix 4

(anu-)

kāśhni, iv 12

kaśa i 33 (samana) 37 xvii

5 -c 1, 35, 36, vi 4, x 12

xi 19, xxi 1, xxi 13, xxi

2, xxiv 5, 6 and padak-

Kalamrāya, c xviii 1

kañḍila, kañḍila, xvi 26

kamca, c 21, u 47, iv 23, v

22, etc.

kamti, c 1 21, 53 61, u 18, 23-

5, iv 23, vii 15, viii 13, ix

7, etc.

ku (=kavarga) c u 47

r kus + sam c 15

kuṇapam, xii 12

kundala, len, c iv 52

kutah, c 18, 21, u 23 v 22

etc.

kutra, c iv 23

kutṛā, iii 10

kuru, v 6

kuryut, iv 52

kutastha, c v 2

karnutā, iii 10

krnudhvāñ sadane, iv
11

krnavan, vi 14

kradhā, viii 26

kradhā suvāh, vii 2

kradhā, iii 13

krṣamādhyā, c xxiv 6

krṣṭa, xxi 12 14

krṣṇah, iv 38

krṣṇaṅghri, c xxiv 6

kena, vii 8

kevala, c 18, 43, 59, u 47,

xiv 33, xxi 1, 2, xxiv 4

kawalya, c x 12v

komala, cxx 12

kaṇḍeyah, xii 12

Kaundmya, see p 430

Kauhaleya, see p 430

kra, viii 26

krāñsyate, xvi 22

krato, xii 8

r kram + atā, c iv 23, xvii

8, xxi 4, + pra, c x 15

krama, xxi 16, xxi 20,

xiv 5, 6 -c u 9, xviii 16,

xvii 2

krayi, iii 13

kriya, c xxiv 4

r kriy, c vi 9

krushta, cxxiii 12-4v

krutā, iv 25

kracit, c xiv 28, xxi 6, etc

kṣha (kṣh), ix 3

kṣhamā, iii 10

r kṣhap + adhā, c xv 9, + m,

c u 18, + pra, c xiv 11

kṣhṛta, c xvii 8, xxi 1

kṣhapra, xx 1, 9 -c xx 8

kha (kh), viii 23

kha, xxi 9 10

khanana, c u 1

khalu, c 18, u 23, iv 32, 37,

etc.

khi, xiv 8

r khyu + d, c ix 20, xx 8,

+ vya c xii 16, xiv 5,

xxi 3 and akhya, vya-

khyana, samkhyā etc

gakara, c xiv 23

r gan, c xvii 6v

gana, xii 9

r gud + m, c 60

r gam, u 50, xxi 6 -c 133,

xiv 3, 4v, + ava, c 133v,

51, xv 7, + upa, c xvi 3,

+ sam, c v 1 and adh-

gama

gamana, c 18, viii 16

gamayatah, iv 52

r gar + sam, c 21, xi 1

- garbhakā*, xi 3
garbhām, iv 24, 42
gala, c xii 9 (-*vivara*)
gana, xiii 9
gatra, c xxi 9, 10
ganāṁ, *ganā*, vii 10
Gurudapurana, c xxi 6
gahamānāḥ, xii 8
gā, c intr
guda, c viii 16
guna, ci 35 (*dvī*), 36 (*trī*)
 xv 3
guna, xiii 9
guru, xxi 14 -c intr
gurutā, xxi 5
grānamyagre, xi 16
go, vi 16
gotra, c xxi 6
gomān, ix 21
gauṇa, c iv 23
Gautama, see p 430
guṇava, ci 33, iv 2, viii 13
gnā, xii 5
gnī iv 36
gyānī, vii 10
granthā, c xxi 6v
gīh, c intr 122 25, 50, 51
 59, ii 15 v 25, 40, vi 13
 viii 18, 34, ix 13, x 12, xi 17,
 xiv 6, 22, xv 8, xvi 29, xviii 4,
 +*pari*, c viii 14, ix 9
graha, ix 20
grahana, i 22 24 50 -ci 18,
 22, 26 50 -3, 59, 61, ii 23,
 iii 1 etc, iv 9 etc, v 7 etc,
 vi 5 etc, vii 2 etc, viii 4
 etc ix 1 etc, x 9 etc, xi 3
 etc xii 3 etc, xiii 4 etc
 xiv 17 etc, xvi 1 etc,
 xxii 7, xxiv 2
grāma, vii 2
grāmī, iv 53
grahaka, ci 21
ghakāra, viii 26
ghat, c xiii 15, xv 6
ghata, c ii 7, xxi 3
gharmṣaḥ, xi 5
ghā, iii 8
ghuṣhyā, iii 12
ghṛṇvādn v 21
ghoshavāt, i 14, ii 8, viii 3,
 ix 8 -ci 14 (-*vāṭva*), etc
ghṛṇī, iv 28
ghṛumabala, c ii 52
hā, v 32
nakāra, ix 18
ca (c), v 4, 20, 22, xiii 15
ca, i 22, 32-4, 53, 55, 60, ii 13,
 17-8 23, 42, 51, iv 7, 13, 16,
 18, 25, 26, 46 47, 50, 54, v 5,
 7, 15, 28, 30, 33, 36, 37, 41, vi
 3, vii 3, 6, 7, 14, 16, viii 4, 15,
 17, 18, ix 4, 8, 19-22, 24, x
 16, 17, 25, xi 4, 6, 7, 9, 11, 12,
 xii 6, 10, 11, xiii 3, 14, xiv
 2, 4, 6-8, 17, 19, 20 22, 28,
 xv 1, 4 7 xvi 4, 9, 10, 12, 18,
 23, 28, xvii 4, 5, 8, xv 2,
 xvi 10, xxi 5, 6, 9, xxii 5,
 14, 15 xiii 2, xxi 2, 5
cakara v 22 (=ca) c v 28,
 30, 33, etc
cahṛma iii 10
cahṛe, iv 28
r caḥś + a, xxi 16 -c ii
 44, +*vyā*, c xv 9v, xxi 15,
 +*sama*, ci 1
caḥśhushī, iv 12
caḥkūna, xiii 12
catuh, vi 13
catv, i 8, xxi 15, xxi 1
catvīrtha, i 11, ii 9, v 38, 40,
 xiv 5, xxi 12, 16
catvīyama, xxi 16, 19 -
 c xxi 17 18
catushtaya, c xxi 19, xxi 2
candra, v 5
ca + *ut*, c ii 12, 13, 28, 35,
 44, 50 iv 23, v 1, xvi 8,
 xxi 15, xxi 9, 10 + *vyā-*
bha, c ii 25 and *uccuṇa*
na
carā, iii 8
carāvah, iv 38
carman, xii 13
carshan, xii 13
carshapī, iii 7
cavarga, ii 36 -c ii 44
caturya, c xxi 3
r ca + nah ci 1, xiv 4, xxi
 16 and *niṣṭayaka*
caḥkītvān, ix 21
cit, xviii 2
r cit cīntya, c ii 19, xii 3
cīte, iii 7
cītrā, iii 4
cī, iv 33
i cud codya, ci 14, 53, iv
 11
cupunika, xii 12
crīd iii 12
ceṭ, xx 3, xxi 9 -c ii 25, etc
coṭtāme, iv 11
cha, v 22, xiv 8
chāḥśvīn, xvi 13
chakāra, v 34
chatva, c v 22, 35, 37
chandasvāt, iv 20
chandobhashā, xxi 5 -
 c xxi 6
ga (g), v 23
gahara, v 23, xii 5
gaḥśhīvī, xvi 13
gagumā, iii 10
gaghanya, c viii 13
gaghniṣvī, xvi 13
gāḥśe, xi 16
jatā, c ii 1 xi 9, 16, 17, x 2
r jan jayāl, xxi 2 *jan*
yate, c ii 8, v 1
janayathū, iii 10
janayā, iii 12
janishīvī, iii 8
janman, c ii 1
janmanī, iv 12
janāya, ci 40
jambhūya, ii 17
jayatū iii 10
jālā, c ii 1
jatā, c v 9 (*varna*)
jātāḥ, viii 32
jatā (*tyopchshu*), c ii 35, iv
 2
jayamānāḥ, xii 8
jālā, ci 46, viii 22
jigā, xvi 13
jigāsī xvi 18
jigvī, xvi 13
jigḥā, xvi 13
jigḥāsī, xvi 18
jihvā, ii 20
jihvāgra, ii 18, 37, 38, 41
 (-*madhya*) -c ii 19, 20, xxi
 15
jihvāmadhya, ii 17 (*anta*),
 22, 36 40 (*ānta*) -c ii 20
jihvāmūla, ii 35
jihvānūlyā, i 18, xiv 15 -
 c ii 44
jihvika, c viii 16
jigvīd, xvi 13
juṣhānāḥ, xi 16
juṣhī, xi 3
juhūtā iii 12
jñā, xxi 6
r jñā, xx 2 -ci 29, 50, x 17,
 etc, *jñāpay*, c iv 40, xii
 6, 11, xvi 9, 10, xix 2, +*ve*
vyāḥśe, xxi 5 -ci 7, 52,
 53, 61, ii 18, etc, +*sam*,
 c xx 1. and *vyāḥśatva*
jñāpaka, c iv 47
jñāpāna, c viii 18
jñā, iv 39
jyā, x 13
jyāyā, xvi 13
jyotiḥ, vi 13
ñakīra, v 24, 37

- ta* (r), v 33, vii 13, xiii 15
taṭṭi, c 1 21
taṇṇiya, ii 37, vii 11, vii 20 - ii 44, vii 28
taṇṇiyā, c vii 14

tha (th), vii 14

du (d), vii 16
dakṣiṇa, c iv 38

nā (n), vii 14
nāḥi, vii 1, xiii 6
natva, c 1 51, 60, v 3, vii 2 c 6, vii 7 etc
nāc, c 1 17

ta (t), vii 13
ta (pron.), i 33, 41, 49, ii 3, 7, 31-4, v 27, 38, ix 2, xii 9, xiv 3, xix 3, 4, xx 4, xxi 2, 13, xxii 2, xxiii 13, 16-9
takṣara, v 22, 33, vi 5, 14, vii 15
taṭ, ix 17
tatāḥ, xv 3, xxii 14
taṭra, v 3, xxii 3, 12
taṭra, iii 8
tathā, xxii 14
tathāiva, c 1 43, ii 20
tathābhava, c 1 61
tadānim, c 1 21
tadābhāva, c xiii 9
tanuvāḥ, iv 44
tanu yaṭ, iv 52
tanu, c ii 7
tapāḥ, iii 12
tapasāḥ, xii 8
tapasā, iv 17
tamasāḥ, vii 24
r tar + aṇa, c ii 9
taratā, iii 12
tarā, iii 8
tārḥān, vi 14
tarḥa, c 1 15, 21 ii 25, iii 8, etc
tavārya, ii 38, xiv 20, 21 - c ii 44
tavāryā, vii 15
taṣṭhivā, xvi 13
taṣṭuṭ, ix 17
tasmān, vi 14
tāpārya, c 1 15, 24, 35, 36
tān, vi 14
tābhūtm eva, iv 52
tāmra, c xxi 6
tāra, xxi 11, xxiii 5, 10
tāḥ, ii 22, 36, 40
tāvānt, i 35 - c 1 1, 41, 56, ii 3, 25, vii 16
taṣṭhān, vi 14
taṣṭhantya ekayā, v 19

taṣṭhā, iii 12
taṣṭatara, xvi 1, 4 - c xvi 24, xvi 2, 3 (*ta*)
ta, i 19, 59, ii 14, 25, 29, 33, 45, iv 40, vii 16 ix 9, x 19, 21, xi 1, xiv 5, 11, xv 3, 8, xvi 1 xx 2, xxi 6, xxiv 5
tu, iv 42, v 13
tulya, c 1 33, ii 19 (*ta*), xiv 23
tu, iii 14
tunave, vii 12
tushnim, c ii 20 (*bhava*, *bhūta*), xxi 6 (*-bhava*)
tr, xvi 27
trane, iv 11
tritya, i 11, vii 3, xxiii 12, 16 - c 1 61 (*tu*), xxi 10 (*savana*)
tridye, iv 11
te, iv 40, 42 xi 10
te asya, iv 20
te acaranti, iv 20
Taittirya, xxi 16, 15 (*ka*)
taṣṭavyāyana, xx 7, 12 - c xiv 29, xx 8
trāpu, v 4
tri, i 20, xxi 11, 14
tri, vi 2, xvi 25
trih, i 36
tripadaprabhṛt, i 61 - c 1 59, 61 (*ta*), xi 9, 18
Tribhūshyaṭma, c intr and endings of chapters
trimatra, xxi 13
trirupa, c 1 36
tri, vi 2
trin, vi 14
travindhya, c ii 3
tvāḥ, xi 5
tvām tarā, iii 8
r tvār atvaritam, c xxiii 20
tvāṣṭah, vii 8
tvā, iii 5
tvāṣṭi, iii 7
tve, iv 10

tha (th), iv 7, vii 14
the, iv 40

da (d), iv 7
daṣṭukā, *daṣṭhā*
dhya, *daṣṭam*, *daṣṭanābhyaḥ*, *daṣṭso*
bhish, xvi 19
dakṣa, v 8
dakṣiṇena, iii 10
datte, xi 5
dadusi, xvi 18
dadhanaḥ, vii 6

dadhāsi, xvi 18
dantā, ii 43 - c ii 18 (*pankti*)
dantamula, ii 38, 41, 42
r dar + a, c ix 21, xii 16
darvī, iv 12
r darṣ, c 1 1, ii 2, 5, iv 11, vii 16, ix 22, x 10, xiv 5, 28
darṣana, c 1 59, ii 1, iii 1 (*ad*), xi 19 (*ad*), xii 3 (*ad*), xiv 5, 15, xv 9v, xvi 26
r da + anupra, c ii 8, + *upa*, c ii 7, 8 and *anupra*
dāna, *upadāna*
dadhāra, iv 22
durvya, xxi 9
durdhya, c xvi 1
dāṣva, xvi 13
dāvah, vii 24, 28
dāvī, vi 2
r dāṣ + a, c xiv 4v, + *anva*, c 1 26, 32, 51, 55, 60, ii 19, etc, + *ut*, c iv 2, 52, x 11 + *upa*, xxi 18 - c 1 1, 60, xvi 1, xxi 6, 17, + *ma*, c 1 29, ii 7, 23, x 23, xii 9v, xxi 17 xxiv 5, + *pra*
tvāḥ, c ii 7 and *anvade*
ṣa, *ṣaka*, *adeṣa*, *ṣaka*, *nrdeṣa*, *-ṣaka*
r dāḥ + sam, c xiv 4
dāḍva, xvi 13
dīpa, c xviii 3 xx 12 (*vat*)
dīptya, xxi 13
dīya, iii 12
dirgha, i 3, 35, vii 17, x 2, xxi 14, xxiv 5 c ii 24, iii 1, v 12, etc and *dāv*
ghya
dirgha, iii 5
dhishṭa, c xii 16
dundubha, c xxi 3
durba, c xvi 19, xxi 1
duryan, ix 21
dr, xvi 27
drdha, xvi 6, xx 9 (*tara*)
-c xii 5, xx 10
drdhay, c xxi 19
drdhe, iv 27
drstanta, c xii 15
deva rishah, vii 24
devata phalguna, iv 12
devate, iv 11
Devadatta, c 1 14, iv 52
devā, ii 2
devān, vi 14
Devipurana, c xxiv 6
dega, i 59 - c 1 29, ii 17, vii 21, xix 3
deha, c vi 9
daargha, c xxi 9

- dosha*, iv 23, xiv 15, 22, xvi 19, 29, xliii 20
durvāṇya, c vi 5
dyāvī, vi 2
dyāvapṛthivī, iv 12
dyut, c 161, iv 10, v 15, x 19, xii 14, xliii 6v
dyotaka, c iv 11
dravind, iii 5
dravya, cxiii 3
draghiya xvi 13
druta, c xxi 1 (*vr̥tta*) and *adh*
dva, i 3, iv 45, viii 20
dvandva, ciii 9, x 6
dvaya, c iv 23, 52 etc., xiv 4
dvay, c xvi 6
dvayā, iv 38
dvāḥ, i 35
dviguna, c i 35
dvitva, i 11, 12, xiv 5, 12, xliii 12, 14, 15, 16 - c i 28 (*yā*), xvi 12
dvitva, c v 3, xii 4, xiv 2 etc., xvi 5, 16, xliii 20, xliii 5 etc.
dvimāsa, cxviii 13 - c xliii 1 (*tā*)
dvigama, xix 3, cxviii 17 - c xix 4
dviruktatva, c viii 16
dvirupa, c i 35
dviroshthya, c ii 25
dvivacana, c i 23, ii 15, v 25, ix 13, xiv 6
dvivarna, ix 18, xiv 1 - c xiv 2-4
dvivara, xvi 17
dve, iv 49

dha (*dh*), viii 33
dhakara, cxiv 23
dhātte, iv 53
r dhar + ava, cxvi 12, cxii 6 and *avadhāraka*, *ra na*
dharma, c i 1, iv 52, v 28, viii 15, x 10, 11, xv 8 (*tu*), xxi 1, 10, 15
-dharmaka, c x 10
dharmān, c i 1 v 28
dhārśha, iii 8
dhā + abhi, xxiv 3 - c xiv 5, 28, xvi 3, 7, + *vyava*, c i 17, iv 51v, xiii 7, 14, xiv 30, + *abhiyā*, c i 46, + *abhi*, c xiv 9, + *m* c i 34, iv 2, 8, 41, xiv 4, *vihi* *ta*, c ii 47, xi 4, xliii 15, xvi 28, xx 1, xxi 15, xxiv 2
yathādvihitam, c viii 24, 26, 27, 29-34, ix 24, x 18, + *sam*, c v 3 and *asam* *ta*, *abhidhana*, *vāha* etc., *vihiatva* *vyavadhūma* etc., *samadhūna* etc.
dha, x 13
dhānikā, xiii 12
dhāta *i atih*, xi 3
dhāma, xiv 8
dhama, iii 8
dhāraya, iii 8
dhē, vi 11
dhī, iv 12
dhīa, xvi 8
dhīrasah, xi 16
dhūh, v 10
dhīta, xvi 3 (*-pracaya*) - c xliii 17
dhīta, xliii 20
dhīta, iv 11
dhīruvakshtik, xi 3
dhvāni, c ii 1, xii 1, xliii 6
dhvāna, xliii 5, 7

na (*n*), iv 32, xi 4, xxi 14
na, i 4, 13, 18, ii 12, iv 2, 14, 21, 30, 32, 37, 39, 41, 43, 53, v 16, 21, 29, 35, 37, vi 6, 11, 13, viii 15, viii 7, 14, 19, 26, 32, 35, ix 3, 6, 13, 17, 23, x 13, 18, 20, 24, xii 3, xiii 4, 15, xiv 14, 24, 31, 32, 33, xv 2, 5, xvi 7, 11, 17, 31, xvii 8, xix 5, xxi 7, 11, 16, xxi 8
na, c xvi 21
nah, xi 13
nah pṛthivī, iv 19
nakara, v 20, 24, 26, 33, viii 1, ix 19, xii 6, xv 1, xvi 4
naki, vi 5
nañ, c i 60, viii 33, x 22
namu, c i 1, 2, 15, 18, 21 53, 59, ii 7, 9, 18, 20, 23, 25, 47, iii 1, iv 3 etc., v 1 etc., vi 3, viii 13 etc., ix 8 etc., x 10, 25, xii 9, 15, xiv 4 etc., xvi 2 etc., xviii 3, xx 2, xxi 1, 5
r nam in *vinutitā*
namah, iv 42, viii 30, xi 14
navan, i 2
nah yati, viii 16
nā, iii 8
nāda, ii 4, 8, xxiv 5 - c ii 3, xliii 2
namāpāda, i 48 (*-vat*), xx 3 (*śha*), xxiv 3 - c xx 4 (*śha*)
namāpadīya, i 60
namābhūta, c xxi 3
na bhī, iv 12
namatah, c xliii 5

namadheya, xx 8 - c xliii 3, xli 15
naman, c i 11
nashtā, ii 3, 49, 52 - c ii 30
nashtya, i 18, ii 19, 50 (*mu* *han*), xvi 8, 12, 14 - c ii 50, 51, viii 15, xli 13
na, i 15
nāḥ, xi 4, 5, viii 2, viii 24, 35
natā, c ii 59, v 28
netanta, xvi 24
netya, i 59, iv 14, 39, i 3 54, vi 5, 14, xiv 6, xvi 9, 17, xx 2, 9 - c i 57 (*tu*), iv 10, x 12, xii 11, xiv 5 (*tu*), 19, xx 8, xliii 5 ind an
napuna, c xliii 6
nimada, xliii 58
nimatta, i 60 - c i 11, 22, 25, 59, iv 3, 6, 40, 47, 52, v 9, 22, 35, vi 10 (*-ti*), 19, 22, 24, xi 5, xii 7, 15, xiv 22, 28, xvi 8 (*tu*) and *pu* *an*, *pu* *an*
nimittin, c i 58, iv 3, 45, 47, x 16, xii 15, xiv 28, xv 8
niyāta, see *r yam*
niyama, c i 21, 19v, ii 2, 3, 25, 14, iii 1, iv 23, 52, v 22, viii 8, xii 8, xiii 15, xiv 4, 5, xvi 2, 8, xvi 1, xliii 16
ni *apeksha*, c xvi 1
ni *argala*, c i 15
ni *akarana*, c i 57, x 22, viii 13, xiv 22
ni *apuka*, c xliii 20
ni *upana*, c xli 10
ni *naya*, c i 1
ni *reṇa*, c i 14, ii 43, iv 3, v 24, viii 6, xiii 9, xvi 4
ni *reṇa*, c xii 4 - c i 59
ni *vaha*, c iv 3
ni *vartaka*, c ii 33, iv 40, x 21, xv 8, xvi 9
ni *vr̥ti*, c ii 33, 45, viii 32, xiv 5, 18, xliii 6, xliii 6, 19
ni *yayala*, c xvi 5 (*tu*)
nishidha, c i 21, 59, iv 14, 23, 40, 41, 54, v 16, 30, vi 5 etc., vii 2 etc., viii 15 etc., ix 4 etc., x 15 etc., xi 1, 5, xii 8, xii 4 etc., xiv 4 etc., xvi 12, 18, 29 (*-tā*), xx 2, xxi 5
ni *hedhaka*, c xliii 5
ni *shpaddiyatva*, c ii 20, 23
ni *hata*, c xix 3, 4 (*tu*)
ni *ca*, i 39, xix 1, xliii 20 - c xliii 4, x 3, xliii 17
ni *catva*, xiv 5
ni *ca*, v 8
ni *ca* *haka*, xliii 10

- madhara*, 144
nu, v 13
nuda, iii 8
nu, iii 14
nūna, vii 16
nr, vii 9
nrtyanti, vii 16
nemir devān, vi 14
neshata, viii 8
nirmitika, i 12, iv 28
nirmitiya, c xiv 3
nyaya, i 159, ii 17, 25, 51, v 23, 51, v 35, viii 16, xi 18, xiii 15, xiv 4, xvi 19
nyayya, c xiv 5
nyuna (nti), 142 (tra), ii 23, 23 (tva), xiii 20
nvati, iv 29

pa (p), iv 28, 30
pakira, v 36, viii 23
paksha, c iv 23, 40, v 30, viii 13 ix 6, x 20, xiv 10, 11, 17, xv 3, xviii 5, 7
panka, c iv 23, xiv 4
pankt cu 18
pancam, i 10
panchama, xxii 2 -c xxi 14 (-ma)
panchavṛpati, i 7
pata, cu 7, v 28
r path, c i 51, v 1, 2, ix 20, xxiv 3, 5
pani, *panim*, xii 10
paneta, xiii 12
patangān, ix 23
Patangah, c xxi 1
pataye, *patish*, *patim*, viii 27
patir nah xi 16
pate, iv 35, viii 27
pate, viii 27, xii 8
patni, vi 7
patni ve, viii 27
pathe viii 25
r pad + d, cu i 1-15 v 9, 10, 20-25, 34-7, vi 1-14, etc., *apanna*, c i 51, v 35, v 10, xvi 3, 15, *opad*, cu i 7, xxi 6, + *ut*, c vii 15, + *upa*, c i 1, ii 47, iv 3, 52, v 1, 35, viii 18, xiv 28, xvi 19, + *nih*, c xiv 5, + *pra*, c vi 13, viii 15, + *sam*, xiii 20 and *anupapan*, *na*, *apatti*, *apadaku*, *upat*, *ti*, *upapatti*, *nishpādy*, *prati*, *prati*
pad, iv 44
pada, i 50, 54, vi 4, viii 9, xv 7, xvi 17, xx 2, 6, xxii 13 (vrāma) -c v 1, 2, 3, 10, 12, vi 8, viii 33, ix 1, xiv 5, xx 2, xxiv 6, etc., and *ekap*, *nanap*, *prak*, *lip*, *samanap*
padakala, c i 60 vi 4, viii 9, xv 7, xx 2, 4
padakrama, xxiv 6
padagrahana, i 50 -c i 51-3, iv 11, v 12 ix 22
padapatha c iv 5, v 2
padasamihita, xxiv 2 3 -c xiii 5, 14, xxiv 4
padasamaya, c vi 14
padadi, xvi 28 -c iii 1, 15, etc.
padanta, xiv 28, xvi 14 -c iii 1, iv 3 (ap), 5, ix 11-15 etc., xiii 13 (tva)
padartha, c viii 14
padā, vi 2
padākadepa, c i 23, 50 ii 35, 54, vi 10 12, viii 6, 11, viii 28, 29, xi 15, 17, xii 6, xiii 14, xvi 26, 29
padāhati, c xiv 4
papiva xvi 13
payuh, xvii 8
payasvan ix 21
para, i 8, 9, 30, iv 18, 45, 47, 50, v 7, 10, x 16, 25, xiii 16, xiv 4, 9, 22, 29, xvi 19, xxi 5, 9, *para*, iii 1, 3, 4, iv 4, 6, 24, 28, 30, 32, 33, 37, 38, 42, 44, 46, 52, v 4-6, 8, 14, 17, 20, 22, 23, 25, 27-30, 32 37, vi 5, 14 vii 15, viii 2-4, 7, 11, 12, 14, 16, 23, 25-31, 34, ix 1-5, 7, 8, 10 13, 20, 22, 24 x 2, 4-8, 13, 14, 22, xi 9, 15, 18, xii 4, 5, xiii 2-4, 11, 15, xiv 1, 9, 11-13, 16, 17, 19-21, 23, 24, 26-8, 31, xv 4, xvi 1, 2, 10, 14, 27, xix 3, xxi 7, 9, 11, 12, 14, 16, xxi 15, *para*, xxi 2
paratah, c v 24, viii 6, x 10, 11, xx 3
paratra c viii 33
paratva, c i 15, 30
paramipata, c i 2
paramistha, c iv 7 25, v 24 viii 6, 23 xiv 5, xvi 14
parabhuta, c viii 33, xx 4
parama, xiv 8
paraspara, c i 3, v 2 (ram vaya), xv 6 (do)
panamarin, cu 7
pari, i 15
pari vii 4 viii 28
pariva, viii 34
parikalpana, c viii 7
parigraha in ap
paribhasha, c iv 52
parimāna, xxii 2 -c i 37
parisamapta, c i 61
parihara, c iiii 1, 14, 21, 53, 59, ii 9, 20, iii 1, iv 54, v 28, viii 18 ix 8, xiii 14, xvi 13
pari, iii 7, vii 4
parikshana, c xiv 5
pariksha, c i 1
paruh, viii 32
paryania, c i 5 6, iii 9, etc.
paryavasana, c i 1
paryaya, c i 47, ii 47, xiv 22, xix 3, xxi 16, xxii 3
pavarga, ii 39, ix 4 -c ii 44
pagu, c i 14 (-mant), xiii 7
pagun, vi 14
pa, x 13, xvi 2
pakavati, c xii 13
patha, c i 15 (vishesha), iii 1, vi 12, vii 16, viii 27 ix 21, x 13, xiii 16, 16 (-antara), xvi 19, 20, 26, 29
pāthakrama, c i 1
pani, xiii 9
panmitya, c i 15, 53, xiv 4, xviii 1
pathah, xi 16
patha esha, xiv 8
patha, iii 10
pada, c xii 13
padavritta, ix 6 12 -c xiv 29, xx 8
payubhish, vi 5
paraya, iii 12
parishesha, c i 4, 14, ii 23, xiv 28
pari, iii 7, vii 4
pari, v 11
palay, cu 17
pingalaksha, c xxiv 6
pit, iv 7
pitah, viii 8
pitarah, xi 16
pitri, vi 14
padhana, c xvi 3
pivva, viii 25
pipihka, c xii 13
piba, iii 8
pivva, xvi 13
pu, xvi 9, 13
punilanga, cu 7
punya, xii 9
put, viii 28
putrah, xi 16
puna, viii 8 32
punarukta, i 61 -c i 33 (ta), xi 9 (-tva) and *punar-*
ukhya
punarukta c xxi 10

- punarvacana*, c viii 13, xxiii 7
purastāt, c 143, iv 2, vi 5
puṣṣaḥ, xi 16
puṣṣpā, iii 5
pūga, cv 41, viii 16
puṣṭi, iii 7
pūrita, c xvii 8
purna, xvii 8
puṣṭe, iv 26
purte, iv 11
purva, i 29, ii 28, iv 13, 16, v 3, 31, 37, viii 17, xi 19, xii 9, xiii 9, xiv 5, xv 5, xvi 3, *purva*, i 4, ii 15, iv 7, 40, v 4-6, 8, 9, 12-14, 12-6, 38, vi 2, 4, 7, 11, 13, vii 2, 4, 7-9, 11-13, viii 16, 23, ix 9, 18, 20, 21, x 3, 9, 19, xi 1, 5, 8-11, 13-16, xii 3, 6, 8, xiii 6, xiv 1, 2, 6-8, xvi 4, 9, 11 xix 2, xx 2, 2 (ap-), 7, xxi 14, *purva*, ii 48, xv 1, xix 5, *purve*, xv 9, *purvam*, ci 1, ii 1
puṣṭavaj, iv 11, 23
purvataḥ, c x 10, 11, xi 3
purvatara, c xvi 19
purvanumitta, c ix 19, xi 5 (tva)
purvapada, i 49 -c iii 1, 15, v 3
puṣṭaparibhūta, c x 2, 6
pūrvokta, c ii 19 etc
pāśu, x 13
prāṇa, xii 16 (*svara*), xvi 3 (*varṇa*) and ap-
prāṇasva, iii 8
prāṇak, ii 23, 25 25 (tva), v 41, xiv 15, xv 10
prāṇakāna, c iv 11, ix 8, 9, xiv 15, xvi 6
prāṇavi, iv 19
prāṇaviyāṇa, xi 16
prāṇatī, iv 15
prāṇatī, iii 7
prāṇatī, xi 16
prāṇatīya, * ix 20 -c ix 23 (tva)
pra, viii 29
poshān, ix 21
pāṇarukṭya, c i 37, ii 47, iv 23, xiv 4, 22, 28
pāṇanika, c xxiv 6
pāṇurusha, c xxiv 6
Pāṇishkarasāda, see p 430
pra, i 15
pra, iv 33, vii 4, viii 34
prakatay, c xvii 3
prakarsha, c ii 20, xii 9
prakāra, c i 15 ii 6 iii 7 v 10, viii 19
prahayaka, c iii 9
prakṛta, ii 25 -c i 35, ii 3, 7, 15, v 25, 30, viii 15, viii 6 (tva), xv 8, xvi 16 (tva), xxi 20 (tva)
prakṛti, ii 7, v 2, ix 16, xiv 4, xxi 1, xxi 5 -c iii 1, v 22 (tva), x 24 (-vat), xii 9-13 xiv 28, xix 3 (*svārta*), 4, xxi 2 and *prakṛta*
prakṛtupada, c iii 1
prakṛtshta, ii 15
prakṛtalanā, c iv 23, xiv 4
pragraha, i 60 iv 1, x 24, xv 6 (ap) -c iv 2 etc x 15, xii 8, etc
pracaya, xvi 3 (*dhṛtāp*), xiv 2, xxi 10 -c xxi 6 (tva), 11, xxi 16, 17, 17 (tva), 20
pranava, xvi 1 -c i 1, xvi 1-7
pranyasta, ii 20
prati, i 15
pratidhvani, c ii 3
pratipatti, c xi 3
pratipadapatha, c vii 16, viii 27
pratiprasava, c vi 13, viii 8, 13, xiv 24 32
pratibandhaka, c iv 39
prativyeshana, c iv 11
pratyut, c ii 3
pratiśhedha, c i 11, iv 43, v 36, 37, viii 13, xii 8, 13, 15, xiv 4, 24, 32v, xv 3, xvi 17, xxi 1, xxi 9, xxi 6
pratiśhedhaka, xxi 8
prati, c ii 23
pratte, iv 11
pratyak, ii 41 -c ii 42, 42 (tva)
pratyaksha, c viii 34, ix 9
pratyagātman, c ii 41
pratyahgatva, c i 34, xxi 1
pratyāya, v 7 -c i 11
pratyūddharana, c xii 3
pratyekam, c v 10, 15, xxi 15, xxi 5
prathama, i 11, 12, 27, ii 11, v 3, 38, viii 1, xi 3, xiv 9, 12, 17, xxi 16, xxi 12, 14 -c i 23 (mā), xxi 12
pradipa, c xviii 3
pradeja, c i 59, ii 18, 42
pradejmi, c xxii 17
pradhāna, c i 58, xxi 2 (tā)
pradhānānām, c viii 15
prapāñcita, c i 59
prabandha, c viii 9, xii 15
prabala, c ix 13
prabhṛti, i 61, iv 22, 23 -c i 11, ii 3, iii 9, v 10, 38, xvi 18
prayatna, xvi 6, 7 -c i 3, xvi 24, xvi 1, xvi 4, xiv 5, xi 9-12, xxi 6
prayoga, xvi 4, 7 (*yathu*), xvi 6 -c i 7, 18, 42, ii 7, xiv 24, xvi 19, xvi 6, 7, xvi 3, xvi 3, xvi 10, 14, xxi 3 and ap-
prayojana, c i 2 etc, ii 4-6, v 1, xiv 4, xvi 23, xvi 1, xvi 1, xvi 11, 12
pravāna, i 47
pravarita, iv 52
pravada, xvi 9 -c xvi 9 (tva), 10
pravāna, c i 61, iii 9, iv 52, ix 20, xi 3, xii 15, end'gs of chap xii, xiv, xvi -c xiv
prāṇishṭa, x 5, 11 -c x 8
prāṇatī, c xiv 4v
prasanga, c i 53, ii 9, iv 52, 54, v 22 xiv 22, xvi 2 and atp
prasaraṇa, c v 22
prasiddhi, c i 2, ix 7
prastha, iii 5
prāṇ, iii 5, viii 7
prākṛta, vi 14, viii 14, xiv 28 -c v 22, viii 14
prāṇ, c xiv 5
prama, v 1
prāṇak, viii 8
prāṇasava, c xxi 10
prāṇatī, c i 46
pratapadaka, c i 22
pratyākṣya, c intr, and end'gs of chapters
pratyut, c ii 3 -c xxi 2
prāṇatī, xx, 3, 11 -c xiv 29, x 8
prāṇamika, c iv 23
prāṇa, c ii 17
prāṇana, c xii 14
prāṇa, c i 13, 18, 19, 34, iv 43, v 3, 10, vi 14 (tva), xii 8, xiv 19, xvi 29
prāṇa, c i 59, ii 1, iv 14, 39, 43, 54, v 13 etc, vi 7 etc, vii 15-8, viii 7 etc, ix 3 etc, xii 13-5, xiv 5 etc, xv 5, xvi 5 etc and atp
prāṇatī, c i 59
prekshavān, c xxi 1
prerana, c ii 2
pra, vi 2
Prākṣhāyana, see p 430
Prākṣh, see p 430

- phuta*, i 4, 36, x 24, xv 7,
 xxiv 5 - i 20, ii 12, iii 1
 ix 9, x 15, xv 7 (*vat*), 8
pluti in *mandukap*
*phana*t, xiii 12
*phalyan*i, iv 12
r badh + *upa*, c i 59, + *sam*,
 c ix 21, xiv 18, + *abhisam*,
 c v 10 and *upabandha*,
prabandha
r badh (*bādha*), c i 61, xvi
 19 and *budha* etc
barsva, ii 18 - ii 19
bala, c i 53, ii 18
balavant, c xvi 19, xvi 1
ba hule, iv 11
bahuvacana, c i 23, v 24, viii
 6
bahuvvara, iv 40 - c viii 10
 (*iva*), xvi 12, 18 (*iva*)
bahūpādāna c vi 10, 12, vii
 6, 11 viii 10, 29, xi 15, 17,
 xiii 14, xvi 26
Balabhiṣṭura, see p 430
bāna, viii 9
bānavān, ix 21
banajāya, xiii 12
bādha, -*dhana*, c xvi 19, xxi
 5, xxiv 5
bādhyā, c xi 5
bāhukya, c iv 23
biddhrtas ta, iv 52
biddhrtā, iii 10
r budh, c i 53, xiv 28, xix 4,
 xx 10, xxii 2, xxiv 2, +
 na, xxii 15
buddhnyā, x 18
brhadākapala, c xxiv 6
brhadgala, c xxiv 6
brhaspati, vi 7
bodhaka, c xxi 14
bodhana, c xvi 29
bodhā, iii 8
brahma ja, iv 25
brahmana, xiii 13
Brahmaguṇa, c xxiv 6
brahmaloka, c xxiv 6
brāhmama, c i 61 (*-vīkya*),
 xiv 33, xxi 1
r bru, xviii 1 - c i 2, 36, 46,
 iii 1, iv 3 etc, v 22, 37, viii
 16, ix 23, x 10, xi 9, xiv
 4 etc, xviii 2, xix 3, xxi
 1, 13, xxiii 20
brakṣ, c intr, xxi 6, 15
brāhga, c i 53, ii 9, iv 52, v
 10, 22
brahṅurā, iii 5
r bhaj, c v 26-30, 38, vi 5-
- 16 viii 24-32, ix 2 etc,
 x 24, xi 19, xiv 5, xvi 2
 etc, xxi 2 etc, 15 (*bha*
gyamane) and -*bhag* etc
vibhagya etc
bhag d, iii 8
r bhan, c i 15, 57, xxiv 3v, 4,
 6
bhadra, xii 3
bhaya, c xiv 4
bharatā, iii 11
Bharadvaja, see p 430
bharā, iii 12
bharishyanti, iv 19
bharema, iii 10
bhavatah, iv 52
bhavata, iii 12
bhavanti, c i 21, iv 23
bhava, iii 8
Bhavishyapurana, c xxiv 6
bhuga, c v 1 (*veda*-), xiv 28,
 xix 3 (*veda*), xxi 15 (*sva*
ra)
bhagadhe, iv 11
bhag, c xiv 18 (*mushedha*-)
 and *kuryabha*
bhagana, c xvii 8
bhama, c xviii 3
bhumitah, xii 8
Bhadradvaja, see p 430
bhāva, v 1, 31, x 17, xv 1
 xvii 4, xx 1, 5 - c i 61, ii
 12, viii 16, xxiv 5 and
abh
-bhāva, c iii 1, x 12
r blush, c i 14, ii 14, 33, viii
 19
bhāsha in *chandobh*
bhāshya, c intr
r bhās, c intr
-bhāh, viii 14
bhinna c i 3, 29, iv 11, xiii
 15, xxiii 18
bhima, *bhimasena*, c xviii 3
bhuja, xiv 8
r bhu, ii 3, xxii 11, xxiii 4
 -c v 1, + *sam*, c i 49, ii 7
 iv 23, viii 13, xiii 15 and
sambhava
-bhuta, c ii 2, iv 23, viii 5
 etc etc
bhute, xiv 8
bhuyans, ii 11
bhuyasah, xvi 13
bhushana, c intr, xvi 19
bhūswa c intr
bheda, c iv 40, 47, viii 18, 21,
 xiii 9, xiv 22, 28, xviii 3,
 xxi 2, xxiii 7, 18, xxiv 4
 and *abh*
bhyām, viii 14
bhraṅrate vi 22
- ma* (*m*), iv 7, xv 1, xvii 4,
 xvi 14
mah, xii 6
*maṅsat*u, *maṅsy*e, xvi
 20
maṅhishtasaya, xvi 28
makara, v 12, 27, 35, viii 4,
 xiii 1
maṅshu, iii 14
mangala, c i 1
maṅca, c vi 9
mani, viii 9
mandala, c xxiii 16, 17
mandūkaphuta, c ii 17, iv 51
mata, c i 21, 59 ii 2, 19, 27,
 47, v 1, 36-41, viii 18, 19,
 etc etc
mati, xvii 8 (*yatham*)
madhuma, ix 21
madhya, ii 6, 41, 45, xix 1 -
 c i 10, ii 2 (*-deṣa*) viii 15
 (*sṭha*), xvi 15
madhyama, c viii 4, xxi 11,
 xxiii 5, 10 - c xxiii 17
r mam, c i 15, 18, 19, 21, ii 47,
 v 2, 31, viii 23, xiii 13 xiv
 5, 33, xv 9, xvii 1-8, xix
 3, xxiii 19, + *sam*, c v 41,
 xv 8 and *mata* etc
manah, xiii 6
manah, viii 9
mantra, c iii 9
manda, c xxi 20 (*am*)
mandadh, c xi 3
mandra, xxi 11, xxiii 5, 10,
 11, 12, 15, 16 - c xxiii 13
manya manah, xii 8
mayani, viii 12
martah, xi 5
maritān, ix 21
maryāda, c i 1, iv 23
marṣ + *parā*, c xv 3 and
paramarṣin
malimlu, vi 7
maṅun, ix 21
mahaprishṭhya, xi 3
Mahabharata, c xxiv 6
Mahabhashya, c ii 7, v 2
maṅi, vi 2
maṅi, iv 34
ma, x 13, xvi 8, *mā pa*-
*ta*m, iv 42
mākt, vi 5
Macakya, see p 430
matah, viii 8
-matra, xviii 1, xxii 13 - c i
 21, 56 61, ii 13, 19, 25, 33,
 etc etc
matra, xxiv 6
matrika, c xxi 15
mādhyaṇḍina, c xxiii 10
Māyikaya, see p 430

- mārdava*, xxi 10
māśa, *masām*, *masi*,
masu, xvi 12
māśe, iv 53
Māhasheya, c intr, i 14, 59,
 ii 14, 33, iv 40, viii 19, 20,
 22, xiv 28, xviii 7
mithu, v 4
mithuni, iv 53, x 18
mithu, iii 14
misra, c xxi 3
misra, c ii 23
misha, c xxi 19
ni, xvi 9
nidhuh vi 5
Mumukshaka, v 41
nukha, i 350
nukhya, c i 43, ii 23, 25, iv
 23, 52, v 22, x 12, 12 (-*iva*),
 xii 3, xiii 14, xiv 17 and
am
nuñca, iii 8
numa, c v 31, xvii 1
mushṭa, iv 12
murdhan, ii 37 -c xiii 16,
 xiii 17
mula, c xii 14, xiv 5 (*sūtra*)
mulakāśa, c ii 8, xvi 1
mr̥dā, iii 8
mṛtyu, vi 7
mrd, c ii 7, xvi 3
mrdutara, x 11 and *mar*
dava
me, xi 11
meghā, iii 5
-men, xiii 12
medhye, iv 11
melana, c i 40
mo, vi 2
mna, xiii 14

ya (*y*), v 30, x 15, 19, xii 4,
 xiii 3, xiv 21, xxi 1
ya (pron.), ii 32, 34, xxi 14
 15
yaśsat, *yaśśaś*, xvi 20
yakāra, ii 40, ix 10, 20, xv 1,
 xvii 4, xx 2
yajśe, xvi 18
yajyām, ix 23
yajurveda, c i 15, xxiv 6
 and *yajurvedika*
yajña, iv 44
yajñakarma, c xv 9
Yajñadatta, c i 14
yajñe, xi 16
yāt, iv 33
yatra, ii 31, 33, xix 1, xx 2
yatrā, iii 8
yatva, c i 4, viii 8, ix 7, 13,
 21, 22, x 18
yathā, i 61 (*ukta*), v 27 *yuk*-
ta, xvii 8 (*mat*), xviii 7
(-prayoga), xiv 4 (*sva*)
yathākrama, c i 11 ii 44, x
 10, xiv 5, etc
yadā, iv 38
yadā, iii 13
yadrachaya, c xxi 6v
yam kramdasi, iv 20
yam + m, c i 1 *nyata*,
 c i 49, v 6
yanna, xv 9 (*ekay*), xxi 13,
 xii 12, xiii 11 -c i 1, ii
 49, xv 9 xvi 3, xxi
 8, xiii 17 and *duy*-, *ca*-
twy-
yamāh, xii 3
yamān, ix 23
yavena, vii 6
yashṭah, viii 8
yajurvedika, c i 1
Yājñavalkya, c xiv 6
yajñya, c xv 9
yajya, iii 9, 11, ix 20, xi 3
 -c i 61, iii 1, ix 23 (*tva*)
yatu, iii 10
yadrchika, c xii 9
yamān, vii 6
yamēna, vii 10
yavat, i 41 (-*ardha*) -c i 22,
 58, xvi 15, xxi 3, xiii
 11
yukta, v 2 (*yathu*) -c i 18,
 19, 61, x 12, xii 14, xiv
 28 and *ay*
yukta, c iv 23, xii 15 (*anta*
ya), xiv 4 (*do*), 5 (*do*)
yuy, c ii 23, iv 11, + *pra*-,
 c vi 5, xvii 2, 4, 7, xxi 4,
 + *upa*, c viii 13, xiii 10,
 + *sam*, c xiv 26v and
yukta etc, *prayoga* etc,
yoga etc, *samyukta* etc
yukshvā, iii 8
yuvayor yaś, xi 16
yushmān, vi 14
yushmānītaś, xiii 15
ye, xi 16
ye aprāthetām, ix 20
yenā, iii 12
yogavibhāga, c ii 12, 3
yogyatva, c ii 37
yogand (sūtra), c i 35, xiv
 28
yo rudrah, xi 16

ra (*r*), i 19, vii 11, xii 6,
 xiv 15
raśyate xvi 22
rañhyat, xvi 29
rakshā, iii 8
raghīyā, xvi 13
ranga, c i 1, ii 52

ra + va, c intr, i 18, viii
 19
raṭha, xi 5
raṭhamāra, c iv 11
raṭh, xi 7
raṭh + a, c i 2, 5, 11, 33, 17,
 iv 22, 23, v 1, x 10, 24,
 xxi 9 xxi 5 xxi 2 and
raṭha etc
raṇṇya, c iv 23, xiii 13,
 xiv 13
raṇṇ, ix 23
raṭh rahita, c iii 15, xxi
 20
-ra, xiv 4, xvi 4
raṭ, c xii 1
rajadanta, c ii 2
raṭra, iii 7
raṭha, viii 29
raṭe, xi 9
raṭn, xii 14
raṭ, c i 6 xxi 1
rasah, vi 5
-ra, xvi 25
ra vyatīkṣta, c iv 52, ix
 20, xiv 28, xiv 5 and
atīkṣa
raṭha viii 24
ra, vii 12
raṭa, c i 18 (*ar*), iv 40
rudra, xi 3 -c i 61
rudrah, xi 16
raṭh + va, c xiv 4 and
anurudha, *virudha* etc
raṭhe, iv 14
raṭh + ā, c xiv 9
raṭhēnā, iii 10
raṭa, xii 2 -c i 14, 29, 30,
 59, xii 11, etc etc
raṭ + m, c ii 1, xviii 1,
 xxiv 4
raṭpe, iv 11
repha, ii 41, v 10, 29, vi 8
 (*van*), viii 6, 7, 16, 20, ix
 20, xii 2, xiv 4, 6, 19, xv
 1, xvi 4, xxi 15
raṭvate, iv 11
rodasi, iv 17

la (*l*), v 25, 31, xii 16, xiv 2,
 31
lakāra, ii 42, v 25, xiv 7, 26
 -c i 1
ra lakṣ, c i 40 iii 9 vi 9,
 xii 13; + *upa*, c i 29, 38,
 39
lakshana, c intr, i 1, 38, 48,
 ii 3, 18, 23, 25, iii 1, iv 43,
 v 26, ix 1, xi 18, xii 15,
 xiv 29, xv 9v, xix 3, xx 2,
 xxi 5, 7, 20, xxiv 5, 6 and
upal

- lakshya*, c 122, iv 52, viii 5
 (*tva*), xv 9 n
laghu xxii 11, 15, xxiv 5
 (*tu*)
 i *labh*, c 11, 14, 16, 21, 25,
 27, 32, 34, iii 1, etc etc,
 xiv 4, + *upa*, c 15, viii
 10, 13 and *upalabdh* etc
 r *lamb* + *a*, c iv 11
laghava, c vi 3
labha, c 121
linga, c 149, ii 7, xii 9, xv 6
 r *lup*, viii 16, ix 1, 9, x 14,
 19, 22, xi 1, x 1, xvi 4 -
 c 14, 61, v 12-9, viii 17-9,
 x 14, 20-2, 23 (*haptavat*),
 xi 3-18, xii 2-10, xiii 2-4
leṇa, x 23 -c iv 23, xiv 4
loka, c iv 52, xxii 9 (*vat*)
lokān, vi 14
loke, iii 6, iv 53
lopa, i 56, 57, v 11, xii 1, xiii
 1, 15 xv 1 xvi 4, xx 4,
 xxiv 5 -c i 51, 61, viii 8,
 17, 18, ix 9, x 19, 25, xii
 6, 8, xxi 14 and *al-*
lopa, i 23 -c i 24
lūkika, c 11
lyap, c xxi 14

va (*v*), iii 4, xii 4
vaḥ, xi 16
vañcam, xvi 21
vañsagah, *vañsate*, xvi
 20
vakdra, ii 43, v 13, 30, ix 16,
 x 15, 19, 21, xiii 3, xiv 2,
 21, 26, xx 1, 2
vaktra, c ii 37
 x, *vac*, i 61, xxii 19 -c i 7, 50,
 52, 53, 59, 60, ii 23, 24, iv 2,
 3, 11, viii 10, 18, ix 24, xi
 2, xii 1, xiii 4, 5, 8, 13, xiv
 4, 5, etc etc, *vvaksh*,
 c ii 37, xii 15, + *pra*,
 cxiv 4 and *ukta*, *ukta*,
vāc etc, *vvakshā*
vacah, xi 16, xii 6
vacana, c 11, ii 7, iii 2, 7, 8,
 iv 23, 38, v 2, vi 5, 13, 14,
 vii 2, viii 8, 13, ix 1, x 14,
 xi 16, xii 11, xiv 5, 15, 23,
 28, xv 8, xvi 29, xix 3
-vat, i 48, 55, ii 21, 51
-vat, iii 3
vatsarasya rupe, iv 11
vatsānusārma, c xxii 13
vatsānusār, c xxii 13
 r *vad*, xxii 20 -c i 48, ii 9,
 iv 52, v 3, xiv 4, 23, xvi
 13, etc, + *apa*, c xiv 5
 and *apavāda*, *daka*
-van, iii 3, viii 6
vanaspatiḥhyah, xii 8
vapariḥ apariḥ, iv 12
vayunā, iii 2
var + *m*, c i 19 ii 14, iv
 40, xi 1, xii 4 xiv 4, xx
 2, + *m*, c xii 14 and *m*
vrta samvrtā
varasuci, c 18, ii 14, 19, ix
 40, viii 19, xvi 7, xxi 15
varga, i 10 27, ii 51 (*vat*)
varcas, iv 53
 r *varj*, c iv 52, ix 20, xvi 25
varja, c iv 20
varna, i 1, 16 20, 56, ii 7, xii
 5, xvii 7, 8, xxii 1, 2, 4,
 xxiii 1-3 -c viii 15, xvi 8-
 10, xx 2, etc
varnakrama, xxiv 6
varnasamhata, xxiv 2 -
 c xiii 14, xlii 4
varnata, c 11, xviii 1
varṭ, c ii 47, iii 1, 15, iv 5,
 23, 45 52, 54, v 10, 19, etc
 etc, + *anu*, c i 36, ii 30,
 viii 34, x 9, + *m*, c i 18,
 51, 59, 60, ii 25, ix 9 x 15,
 19, xi 1, xiv 5, 11, xv 3,
 xxi 6 + *pra*, c v 1, 3, 22,
 xiv 5 and *anuvartana*,
anuvr̥tti, *avrti*, *nvartana*,
nvrti
varṭamanatva, c iii 15
varṭaya, iii 12
varṭayasi, xvi 18
varṭan, c ii 47, viii 23, ix 18,
 xxi 3
vardhayā, *vardha*, iii 8
varshayathā, iii 10
varshā, iii 5
varshishthe, xi 16
varṣān, ix 21
vasṛya, xvi 13
vasuḥ, viii 31
vasu, iii 7
vastah, viii 8
vā, i 24, 44, 45, ii 50, xviii 7,
 xix 1, xx 2, xxii 7
vaḥ, vii 2, viii 8
vañeshah, xi 16
vakya, c 161, xxiii 3 3 (*-ta*)
vagha, vii 13
vac, xviii 4, xxiii 3, 4 -c xiv
 4, 5, xxiii 5-10, xxiv 5
vacuka, c 18 v 28, xxi 9,
 xxii 4
vacayati, iv 52
vācin, c i 15, v 10, xvi 30
vacya, c 18, iv 47, xiv 5
vajapeya, xi 3 -c i 61
Vajasaneyam, c xiv 33
vanah, *ata*, xiii 12
vanjyaya, xiii 12
vanah, xiii 12
vātah, xi 5
vāta, iii 5
Vatsapra, see p 430
vadu, c xiii 9
van, iii 3
vayu, ii 2
vayuh, iv 42
varasuci, c iiii 7, viii
 20, 22
varunan, v 21
Valmiki, see p 430
vag, iii 7
vasas, iv 17
vahanah, vii 6
 c, i 15
va, iii 15, xvi 25
vikarsha, xi 3
vikāpa, c i 19, 46, viii 22 ix
 1, xiii 16
vikā, i 28, 56, xv 5, xxiv
 5 -c iv 3, v 9 ix 11, 12, 14,
 15, x 8, 9
vikārin, i 23 -c i 24
vikṛta, i 51, xvi 3, 15 -c iii
 8 (*tva*), xiii 15 (*do*), xiv
 28 (*do*) and *av-*
vikrama, xvii 6, xix 1, xxii
 20, xxiv 5 -c xix 2, 5
vikṛya, c viii 8
vigatātva, c xiv 28
vigraha, c xiv 4
vikakshana, xxiv 6 -c xviii
 4
vijñeyatva, c v 2, xxi 1, xxiv
 5
 r *vā* xxii 14 -c i 1 (*vidya-*
manatva), ii 47, ix 24,
 xiii 14, etc
vidatruṇ, ix 21
viduḥ, vi 5
vidma, iii 10
vidva, xvi 13
vidvan, vi 14
vidha, c xiv 33, xvi 29
 xviii 7, xix 3, xxiv 5 etc
vidhana, c i 11, 25, 19, 34, 53,
 ii 9, 13, iv 7, 11, v 2, 3, 35
 x 10, 12, 15, xii 11, xiv 5,
 xvi 29, xvii 5, xxi 1, xxiii
 7
vidhayaka, c xix 3
vidhi, v 2 -c i 14 40 43, 61,
 ii 14, 19, 23 25, 44, iii 8, v
 1, 41, vii 15, viii 7, 15, 25
 (*yatha*-) 28 (*do*), ix 3-6,
 8, 13, 17, 22, 24, x 10, 11, 13,
 24, xi 1, xii 3, xiv 14, 22,
 xv 8, xvi 3, 5, 29, xvii 1, 3,
 4, xix 5, xx 3, xxi 6, xxii
 9, 10 xxiii 16, xxiv 5

vidhṛte, iv 11
vidheya, c xv 7
vinatutū, c xxii 10
vināṣa, i 57
vinivartaka, xxii 6
vinnyaya, xliii 2
vinnyasa, c xxiii 2, 17
vipakṣha, c xxiv 5
vibhakti, c i 23, 28, xiii 9, xvi 25
vibhagya, c v 13
vibhaga, iii 1, xiv 6 -c ii 12, iii 1-15, iv 4, iv 29, x 2 and *yogav*
vidhū, iii 7
viyoga, c v 13
virama, xxii 13 -c xiv 15, xxi 6v
viruddha, c xiv 4, 4 (*vigraha*)
viśuṣe, iv 11
virodha, c i 1, 15 ii 23, viii 15, 16, xiv 5
virodham, c xvi 19
vilakṣhana, c xxi 7
vivah viii 8
vivakṣhā, c i 1, 18
vivara, c ii 37, xxi 9
vivurana, ii 52, and end'gs of chapters
viśiṣṭā, xvi 13
viśiṣṭaḥ paruk, viii 32
vivṛta, ii 5, 45 -c ii 12 (*ati*), xxi 15
vivṛta, xx 6, xxi 6v, xxi 13
viśaśanena, xvi 7
viśāḥṣe, iv 11
viśeṣha, xvii 7, xxiii 1, xxiv 6 -c i 14, 15, ii 13, 31, 33, 47, iv 47, 52, v 10, viii 16, x 10, xi 19, xiv 5, 12, 18, 28, xvi 1, 2, 13, 19, xvii 6, xviii 1, xx 7, xxi 1, xxi 6, 13, xxii 2, xxiv 2, 6 and *av*-*viśeṣhya*
viśeṣha, c i 61, ii 25, iv 11, viii 13, 23, 32, x 9, xiv 6, 28, xv 47, xx 2, xxiv 4 and *prati*
viśeṣha, c i 31v, 33v
viśvataḥ, viii 24, 32
viśvadevyā, iii 5
viśvā, iii 5
viśhama, c xiii 15
viśhaya, c i 1, 15 48, 59, ii 20, iii 8, 9, 11, iv 23, v 15, ix 20, 21, x 19 (*tva*), xli 4, xli 1, xlii 15, xiv 28, 29, xv 9v, xx 2
viśhāykar, c v 24, vii 15
viśhūṣe, iv 11
viśhū, iii 7

Vishnudharmottara, c xxiv 6
visarga c i 51, iv 38, 46, vii 2, viii 16, xi 5, xvi 13
visarjanaya, i 12, 18, ii 46, 48, vi 1 viii 5, xiv 15 -c i 1, ii 47, xliii 7, etc etc
vispashta, c i 1 iv 11, xvi 25, xxi 15
viḥavya, xi 3
vihiatava, c xiv 12
vid, iv 38
vināyutam, xiii 12
viṣṭā, c i 61, v 3, xliii 11 xiv 6v
viyamanaḥ xiii 10
virya, iii 5
virṭi, xliii 17 -c xiv 4 xliii 18, 20
vrśhādāṇ, ah, xvi 19
vrśhan, xiii 13
vrśhnaḥ, xi 16
vrśhnūya, iii 5
veḥ, vi 5
vinu, xliii 9
venupatra, c ix 12 (*vat*)
veda, c i 1, v 1, xiv 9 (*anta* *ra*), xviii 1, xix 3, xiv 5 and *yajur*, *vandika*
vedāṅga, c xiv 6
veld, c xx 2
r veshṭ + prati, ii 37
varakalpika, c xii 7
vākrīta, c v 22, vi 14, vii 2, xiii 13, xiv 4, 5
vandika, c i 1
vanparitya, c xvi 26
vārbhāṣṭhika, xxi 7
vanarthya, c i 61, ii 47, iv 11, 23, v 22, xiv 28, xx 2
vānyākarana, c v 1, xxiv 3
vānyashṭya, c xxi 1
vānyeshya, xxi 2
vāśhnavi, iv 12
viś sam, iv 44
vocatā, iii 12
vyakta, c ii 47, iv 40 v 15, xx 6
vyahga, c xxi 1
vyacasvatī, iv 19
vyāghana, i 6, 14, 17, 21, 37, iii 1, iv 6, v 14, 37, vi 7, xiv 1, 5, 28, 30, xvii 5, xxi 1, xxi 14, 15, xxiii 7 -c x. 12, xvi 3 (*tā*), xxi 1, etc
vyāghāra, c xvi 23
vyātyaya, c xvi 4
vyādhedra, c i 33
vyārtha, c i 31, iv 11, viii 34, xiv 17, xvi 2, xxi 1 and *nyayinīthya*

vyavachēdaka, c ii 25 (*tva*) xx 3
vyavādāna, c ii 25
vyavādāyika, c xiii 15
vyavastha, c xix 3
vyavaya, xiii 15 -c ii 25
vyaveta, i 17, iv 51, vii 5, xiii 7 -i 19 (*tva*), vi 3
vyasta m ativ-
vyastataḥ, c ii 14
vyāharana, c i 57, ii 47, xiii 16 and *varyah*
vyākhyana, c intr, ix 8 xxi 1, xxi 17
vyāvartaka, c xxi 7
vyusa c xxi 6
vyāhṛte, iii 7
vyudasa, c xv 9v

ṣa (ṣ), v 22, xiii 15 xiv 26
ṣa, xvi 2
ṣaṅsta, xvi 5
ṣak, c ii 12, 23, xxi 1 and *ṣakya*
ṣakura, v 4, 20, 34 -i 44
ṣakun, vi 7
ṣakti, c ii 33
ṣakṭr, iii 7
ṣaṅk + a, c xxi 15, xxi 14, xxiii 11
ṣaṅkā, c i 3, x 22, xiii 13, xiv 4, 15, xxi 10
ṣaṅc, iii 7
ṣatepārṣṭāṇnyaya, c ii 25
ṣaṭra, iii 7
ṣaṭva, c v 24
ṣabda, ii 1, xxi 1, 3, xxi 3 -c intr, i 1, 7, 15-7, 19-22, 26-9, 37, 42, etc etc and *ay*-
ṣamitah, viii 8
ṣarava, c ii 7
ṣarira, ii 2
ṣaṣvataḥ, viii 24
ṣasanaṁ, xvi 7
ṣikhdā, c xv 8, xvi 12 (*an* *ya*), *ṣikhdāntara*, c iv 11, 12, 15, 37, vi 5, viii 8, xi 3, 9, 15, 16, xii 3 xlii 13 16, xvi 13, 18
ṣakham, c viii 20, ix 4, 6, x 20, xii 16, xiv 10v, 11v, 13v, xv 20v, 32v, 33, xv 9, xxi 13
Ṣāṅkhāyana, see p 430
ṣaryāte, iv 41, xi 16
ṣastra, xix 5 (*purva*) -c i 2, 14, 21, 53, ii 18, xxi 3, xxiv 6
ṣaṣṣumārak xvi 28
ṣaṣṣat, xvi 28

- śekhā*, c 11, 2, 21, u 2, xiv 5,
 28, xix 3, 12, xxi 1, 15
 xxi 13, xxiii 10, 17
śekhāḍa, iii 8
śekhahara, c 11, xxi 15
śepre, iv 11
śeṣa, u 3, xxiii 10 -c x 12
 (komala)
śeve, iv 11
śiśh + vi, c 30, u 44, iv
 7, 34, v 18, 19, 28, vi 5, x
 10, xiv 5, 19 xxi 1 and
avishṭa, *viśeṣa* etc.,
viśeṣhitya
śiṣṭa, c 11
śikā, iii 2
śrīśān, xiii 13
śukla, c v 28
śuddha, iii 2
śuśruva, xvi 13
śuśmāh, xi 16
śunya, c xv 2
śrṅge, iv 11
śrūtā, iii 10
śeṣha, i 6, 14, 42, 46, u 28,
 xii 14 -c 144 5, u 29, 47,
 xiii 15, xxi 15
śeshabhūta, cii 47, iv 3, vi 3
śāntiśāyana, see p 430
śo, xvi 2
śonā, xiii 12
śyete, x 18
śyenāya, xl 3
śrapayān, ix 23
śravana, c iv 35
śrī, vii 9
śru, c xxi 6
śrūta, iv 35, xii 7, xiii 12 -
 c xxi 15
śrūdhi, iii 13
śreyā, xvi 13
śrōṇi, iii 7
śrīśh + sam, cii 12, xvi
 4 and *upaplesha*, *duh-*
śhista, *prapleshta*, *sa-*
śhista
śhloka, c xxi 14, xxi 20
śvā, iii 2
śvāsu, u 5, 10, xxiv 5 -c u 3
sha (sh), vii 13, viii 23, 33,
 xiii 6
shāh, vii 11
shakāra, v 10, 32, vi 1 -c ii
 44
shāt, vii 2
shān, xiii 14
shatva, c 151, 60, v 3, vi 4, 5,
 13, vii 2, viii 16, 35
shash, i 9
shashtha, iv 52
shā, xvi 14
shu, vii 2
shumnaḥ, xiii 15
shu, vii 2
shodāya, i 5
shna, xiii 14
su (s), iv 7, v 32, viii 23, 26,
 xiii 15
sa (prom), v 2, xi 19, xvi
 4, xix 1, xx 3
sah, v 15, 17, vi 9
samyukta, xxi 15 -c xxi 5
 (as)
samyuta, c 154 (as)
samyoga, xvi 4 (gadh), 15,
 xii 14, 15, xxi 3 -c xii
 4
samraṣhana, c vi 5
samvṛta, u 4, 27 -c xxi 15,
 xxi 9 (ta)
samvayavahāra, c 114 xxi
 3
sañjita, *sañjita*, xvi
 26
samślesha, cii 33
sañjva, xvi 26
samsad, xiv 6
sañsadaḥ, xvi 26v
samsarga, xxi 2
sañsrṣhta, xvi 26
sañskṛta, *sañskṛtya*,
 xvi 26
sañsphanaḥ, xi 16
sañsra, xvi 26
saniḥṭā, v 1, xv 8, xxi 10,
 xxi 14 -c 160, 60 (as-),
 iii 1, 8, v 3, vii 10, ix 22,
 24, x 10, 12, xi 9, xiii 5, 14,
 xiv 29, xv 7, xvi 29, xix
 3, xx 2 and *sāmṛta*
sak, vi 12
sakala, c iv 52, xvi 29 (pa
 da)
sakāya, xvi 10
sakāra, v 6, 10, 14, vi 1, 14,
 xvi 1 -c ii 44
samketa, c 121
samkshepa, c xii 6
samkṛtya, xvi 25 -c i 1, 11,
 u 19, x 15, 22, xxi 16
samkhyana, i 48 (as) -c i
 59
samghata, c xii 3
sacasaḍ, iii 8
śay + pra, cii 9, 20, iii 1,
 xix 3, *prasakta*, c 14, u
 29, v 3, 37, ix 13, xiv 5,
 xxi 1 and *ap*, *prasakta*,
prasanga
sayāya, c x 1
sayuḥ, iv 25
sanyāka, c ix 16
samyā, c 12-15, 31-9, 49,
 u 4-6, 9, iii 9, iv 3, 11, 12,
 17, xi 3, xv 6, xix 1, 5, xx
 2, xxiii 16
sanyāka, c 13v xiii 16
sattva, vi 12
satya, c 121, 53, u 18, viii 16
 xiii 15
satyadhama, c xviii 3
sātra, iii 5
śad + pratiya, cii 42, v
 24 and *asanna*
sadane, iv 11
sādṛṣa, xi 19 -c v 28, xiv
 6
sadohaviṛdhane, iv 11
sadbhava, c xiii 14, xiv 28,
 xvi 29
sadhik, vi 5
sanā, *sanāh*, *sanāh*, vi 12
sanātāh, viii 8
santanebhyaḥ, vi 12
samāḥa, i 25 -c i 14, 26, iv
 23, v 1, xxi 2, 5
samāhāna, u 2, xiv 3 -
 c xiv 15
samāha, cii 18, x 15, 24, 25,
 xxi 1
samāhyakshara, c 133, u 47,
 48, xxi 1
samnadāhāh, xii 3
samnikarsha, c xxi 3
samnipata, x 12
sapurna, v 19, viii 22
sapta, xxi 4, 11
saptama, c v 10, xvi 25
saptabhikṣh, vi 12
saptie, vi 5
sadheyah, vi 12
sam, v 6, xii 4, *sam* in
dṛa, vii 2
sama, i 42, 45, 46, xvi 2,
 xxi 19
samābhivyahāra, c xiii 14
samaya, ciii 1, iv 5, vi 14,
 viii 17
samarthana, c xiii 14
samarthanaya, c xvi 19
samarthay, c v 3, xii 4v,
 xiv 4
samāna, cii 23, 47, 48, iv 23,
 v 27, viii 19, 21, ix 8, xxi
 6, 15
samanakala, i 33
samanapada, iv 54, xii 6,
 xxi 13 -c xii 15, 16
samānākshara, i 2, x 2, xv
 6 -c i 3, 4, x 10, xv 9
samānān, ix 23
samāmnaya, i 1 -c i 2, 5, u 1
samāsa, cii 2, iii 9, v 1, x 6,
 xii 9

- samādhāra*, 140 -cintr, 161,
 ix 18, x 6, xiv 1, xviii 4
samāddhah, xi 16
samācra, iv 31
samarana, ii 2
samuccaya, ci 15, 21, xv 7,
 xxi 6, 9
samuttha, cv 1
samudaya, ciii 7, iv 3
samparka, cxxi 1
sampādana, ciii 1, xiv 15
sampratyaya, cv 24, x 12,
 xiv 17
sambandha, ciii 1, v 22, xi
 1, xiv 18
sambandhan, ci 60, ii 3, 50,
 iv 40, xiv 23, 28
sambhava, ci 25, ii 18, 25,
 iii 1, iv 23, v 12, xiv 14
 and as-
sambhāvānā, civ 11
sammittam, vi 12
sar + *ut*, cxiv 15, + *pra*,
 ci 59, iv 3, vi 11, vii 16,
 xi 18 and *prasarana*
sarana, ci 18
sarala, cviii 13, ix 1, xiv 4
sary + *va*, cix 11, + *sam*,
 cxxi 1
sarva, i 47, ix 7, xiv 33, xv
 9, xvii 7, xxii 1, 14, xxiv
 5, sarve, viii 15, xviii 7
sarvatra, ii 25, xii 11, xvi
 2 -ci 18, iv 5, 27, 49, ix
 22, 24, xxii 3
sarvathā, ci 59, v 3, xxiv 5
sarvanāman, cii 7, viii 6,
 xv 3
sarvāṅga, cxxiii 17
sarvānudātta, cvi 4
sava, vi 10
savana, cxxiii 10
savane paçān, vi 14
savargya, viii 2, xiv 23 -
 c viii 3, 4, xiv 12, 13
savarna, i 3, v 28, x 2, xiv
 23, xxi 7 -ci 4
savita, viii 8
savyaṅgana, i 43 -c ii 23
saçabda, xxi 9
saçāda, iii 12
saçrvā, xvi 13
sasthāna, ii 47, 48, v 27, 38,
 ix 2, xiv 9, 13 (as)
saçyāyā, vi 12
saçādriva, cii 47, xiii 16
saḥasāh, viii 28
saḥita, ci 43 (tva), iv 47, v.
 19, xxi 15, xxii 20
saḥura, *saḥūti*, iv 15
r sā + *adhyaya*, cii 7 and
avasita
samhita, ix 17, xx 3 -cxiv
 5, xx 4v and as
suktanishatā, cxiv 15
sānikālpika, cxxiii 6
Samikṛtya, see p 430
sādāyā, iii 12
sādrīya, ci 3, viii 16
sādhanā, cxviii 3, 9, 10
sādharmya, ci 1
sādhurana, cxiv 5, xviii 7v
sādhu, ci 53 (tva), ii 7, 18,
 iii 13 and as
saṁmusika, cv 28, xv 1,
 xvii 5, xxi 14
saṁmusikya, cv 2, xxi 14
saṁnidhya, ci 36, ii 11 etc
 iv 30 etc, v 23, viii 14, 33,
 ix 9, 10, x 9, 21, 25, vii 3,
 xiv 21, xv 8, xix 3
sāpeksha, ci 1 (tva), iv 40
 (ta) xxi 1
sāphalya, cxiv 28
sām, xii 4
samanā, iv 12
samarthyā, ci 61, iv 11 v
 25, viii 16, ix 13, 21, xii
 14, xvi 13, 19
sāmdānya, ci 29, ii 9, 23 v 22,
 x 12, xiv 28, xv 8, xvi 19
sāmya, xxiv 5 -c ii 20, 39,
 45, viii 16
sara, cxiv 5 and as-
sārathīh, vi 13
sarūpya, cxiv 23
surthaka, ciii 1, iv 11, viii
 16
sāhacarya, cxiii 14, xiv 15,
 xvi 13, 26
sāhasra, vi 13
sa, xvi 14, 27
sinhavalokana, cii 51, iv 4,
 xii 3, 15
siñcathā, iii 10
siddharūpa, cviii 19
siddhavaikṛti, cxiv 28
siddhi, cii 20, 25, 47, iv 11,
 23, 52, v 22, viii 13, 18,
 xii 4, xiv 17, xvi 2, 12,
 xxi 5
r vidh, cii 25, viii 8, 16, ix
 7 xii 14, xvi 18, *siddha*,
 ci 11, 14, iv 3, v 26, viii 21,
 etc, + *na*, ci 4, 14, 59, 60,
 ii 25, 29, v 24, 29, 35, viii
 8, ix 13, 21, x 24, xii 16,
 xvi 5, xviii 1, xxi 2, +
pra, ci 4, *prasiddha*, ci
 21, ii 47, xii 14, 15, xix 3,
 + *prati*, ci 4, viii 8, xii 3,
 xiv 33v and *aprasiddha*,
nishēdha, *dhaka*, *prati*-
shēdha, -*dhaka*, *prandha* |
siṭam, vi 12
siṭa, v 5, xvi 25 (asu)
siṭopā, iii 5
sutarani, cii 25
sumatīh, vi 5
sumnu, iii 2
sumnuṇi, iv 12
suvaḥ, v 10, vii 2, viii 8, 13
su, iii 7, 14
suśama, cxviii 3
suç, cxiv 5
sucāha, ci 17
sutra, ci 1, 14, 18, 22, 25, 35,
 39, 46, 50, 53, 57, ii 1 etc,
 iii 1 iv 3 etc, v 1, etc
 oto
sutrahṛt, ci 15
sūtrā, cxiv 6v (as-)
ṣṭṛa, iii 12
so asman, ix 21
sopādika, cii 23
soṁa, ix 21
soṁah, vi 15
soṁaya sva, iv 48
stanam, vi 12
stanvita, viii 8
stābhanatam, iv 52
stārīma, vi 13
stāramā, iii 10
stūtaçāstre, iv 11
stūbh, vi 13
sto, vi 13
stotāh, viii 8
striṅga, cii 7
stha, xv 3 -c iii 1, xvi 24,
 etc etc
stihāh, iv 46
sthāla, ci 61, iv 11, 23, xi 4,
 xix 4, xx 2
sthavira, xvii 4
r sthā, xx 2 -cv 2, xxi 7,
 + *ava*, cix 16, xxi 1, 2,
 + *nyaya*, cxxi 2, + *upa*,
 cxxi 5
sthā, iii 8
sthānum, xii 12
sthāna, ii 31, 33, 44, 46, 49
 xxi 11, xxi 2, 4, 11 -ci 3,
 33, ii 3, 23, 39, 43, 47, etc
 etc, xviii 4
sthānam, vi 10
sthāta, xx 2
sthān, cxiv 28
sthānānu, xii 12
sthāla, cvi 9, xxi 10 (-tā)
sthā, xii 6
sthāurya, cxxiv 5
sthāurya, cxxiv 5v
smagdhātā, cxxii 10
spār dhāh, vi 13
r spar, ii 17 34 35 -c ii 38
 -43

<i>spura</i> , i 7, 10, ii 44, v 27 34, xiii 15, xiv 2 3 9, 27, xvi 9, 12	11, xiv 29, 31, xviii 2, 5, xix 1, xxi 10 11, xxiv 5 - x 10, xvi 6, xix 3, xi 1, xxi 16 17, 17 (<i>two</i>)	+ <i>vya</i> cxxiv 4v, + <i>pari</i> ci 59, iii 1, + <i>upasam</i> , ci 18 32 - ci 22, 23 and <i>u</i> <i>daharana</i> , <i>parihara</i> <i>upa-</i> <i>samhrita</i> , <i>hara</i> <i>samuh-</i> <i>ra</i>
<i>spatana</i> , ii 33 and <i>as-</i> <i>spatana</i> , vi 12	<i>svarupa</i> , ci 21, 40, v 2, xvi 30, xxi 10, 15, xxiv 4 6 <i>sva</i> , iii 5	<i>hara</i> , iii 12 <i>harina</i> cxxi 15
<i>spastha</i> , xvii 4 (<i>ath</i> , <i>as</i>) and <i>sva</i>	<i>svadhyaya</i> cxviii 1	<i>harita</i> (oi <i>har</i>), cxvi 15
<i>spasthika</i> , cxiii 15v	<i>svanaso divi</i> , vi 2	<i>har</i> iv 15
<i>spasthika</i> , cxviii 15	<i>svayoga</i> ci 25	<i>hal</i> , ci 24
<i>spasthika</i> , vi 13	<i>svara</i> , xvii 6, xx 9 cxiii 20 - cxiii 17	<i>havan</i> vii 11
<i>spasthika</i> , cxviii 25	<i>svastha</i> , ci 17	<i>havishtman</i> ix 21
<i>syah</i> , v 15	<i>svasthah</i> , iii 7	<i>hastavinyasa</i> , cxxiii 17
<i>sva</i> , xvi 2	<i>svikar</i> , ci 19, 21, 23 iv 23, 52 xi 3, xiii 14	<i>hah</i> , viii 8
<i>svad</i> , i 60, xv 4 - xvii 5	<i>svikara</i> ci 23 x 12, xiv 5	<i>harita</i> (oi <i>har</i>), cxxi 15
<i>svadhah</i> , xii 8	<i>svina</i> , iii 10	<i>Harita</i> see p 430
<i>sva</i> , xiv 4 (<i>yathu</i>) - xiv 23	<i>ha</i> (<i>h</i>), ii 9 iv 7 xii 4 xiv 26	<i>hi</i> , iv 37 44, vi 2 xvi 13, <i>hi</i> <i>payasvan</i> , ix 21
<i>svatah</i> ci 23, xxi 7	<i>ha</i> , xvi 2	<i>hi</i> <i>shtha</i> , iii 8
<i>svatanta</i> , cxvi 6	<i>hansapada</i> (oi <i>pada</i>), cxxi 15	<i>hinuyat</i> , <i>hinoti</i> xiii 12
<i>svadeva</i> , ci 59	<i>hakara</i> , i 13, ii 6, 9, 16, 47 v 38, xiv 19, xvi 27 xxi 14 - ci 37, 44	<i>hinamayam</i> , xiii 9
<i>svadhava</i> , xii 8	<i>han</i> in <i>nihata</i>	<i>hiranyavarjya</i> ix 20 xi 3
<i>svabhava</i> , cxiii 14 (<i>two</i>), xiv 28	<i>hanu</i> ii 12 (<i>oshtha</i>) 16 - cxxiii 2	<i>hutanu</i> , ix 21
<i>svayampatha</i> , cxv 21	<i>hanu</i> , iii 7	<i>hrd</i> cxxiii 17
<i>r svar</i> , xx 2, 3 - ci 41 and <i>atishvarya</i>	<i>hanumula</i> , ii 35 - ci 17	<i>hodaya</i> iii 2
<i>svara</i> , i 5 33, ii 8, 31, 47, viii 3, ix 10, xi 18, xii 4, xiii 16, xiv 1, 16, xv 1, xvi 2, xvii 5, xxi 1, 2, xxiii 14 xxiv 6 - cxviii 3 xxi 12 xxiii 7, 11, 15-7 etc etc	<i>hanta</i> , iii 10	<i>hetayah</i> xii 8
<i>svaya</i> , vi 13	<i>han</i> in <i>niyata</i>	<i>hotah</i> , viii 8
<i>svarabhakti</i> , ii 19, xxi 6 15 - ci 1, 6, ii 33, xxi 16	<i>han</i> in <i>niyata</i>	<i>hriasya</i> , xvi 13
<i>svarasa</i> cv 22	<i>han</i> in <i>niyata</i>	<i>hrasva</i> , i 3, 20 31, 41, iii 1 ix 18, xvi 16 xxi 15 xxi 3
<i>svaradha</i> , xxi 1	<i>han</i> in <i>niyata</i>	<i>hrasvatva</i> ci 52
<i>svarata</i> , i 40 x 12, 16, xii 9,	<i>han</i> in <i>niyata</i>	<i>hrasvatva</i> , i 37 - ci 42 44 46 xvi 5
	<i>han</i> in <i>niyata</i>	<i>hradu</i> , iii 7
	<i>han</i> in <i>niyata</i>	<i>hva</i> , viii 8

GENERAL INDEX

THE references by Roman and Arabic figures together are, as in the other indexes, to chapter and rule, those by Arabic figures alone (with *p* prefixed), to page of the volume

- a*, *ā*, how uttered, xi 12, how combined with *a* following vowel x 3-9 — *a*, is short, i 32, *ah* to *o* before, xi 7, lost before initial *e* or *o* of certain words, x 14, when initial, lost after *e* or *o* xi 1, detail of cases of its elision or non-elision, xi 2-xii 8, resulting accent, xii 9-11 — *ā*, final, result of irregular prolongation, iii 2-6, 8-12 initial, do, iii 15 — *as*, nasalized when final, xv 8
- abhimdhana*, xiv 9
- abhinahata* circumflex, xi 4 its occurrence, xii 9, its comparative tone, xii 10
- Accent see Analysis, p 437, also Acute, Circumflex, Grave, and the names of the various accents
- Acute accent (*udatta*), defined, i 38, mode of production, xxii 9, acute tone of grave syllables after circumflex, xvi 10-11
- ā*, how uttered ii 26-8, peculiar utterance in a single word xvi 24, combination with following vowel, ix 14, x 19-23, with preceding *a*, d, x 6
- Alphabetic sounds, enumeration of p 8-10, classification, mode of production, etc., see Analysis, p 136, names for, i 16-9
- anudatta*, see Grave
- anusvāra* (Ṛ) its equivocal treatment by the Prātiśākhya, p 67-70, is an independent element, p 8, how uttered, ii 19, 30, how designated, i 18, belongs to preceding vowel, xxi 1, its quantity, i 34, makes a heavy syllable, xxi 14, its occurrence, xv 1-3; do otherwise than as result of euphonic combination, xv 4-5, xvi 1-31
- Arculated sounds, see Alphabetic
- Aspirate mutes sonant, contain *h* sound, ii 9, surd, contain more breath than non-aspirates, ii 11, substituted for non-aspirate before sibilants, xiv 12-3, how duplicated, xiv 5, double aspirates in the MSS, p 290, 294
- au*, how uttered, ii 26, 27, 29, combination with following vowel, ix 15, x 19-23, with preceding *a*, d, x 7
- Authorities quoted in the rules of the treatise, p 430
- avagraha*, name of first member of a compound, i 49, quantity of the pause following it in *pada* text, p 399
- b*, labial mute, ii 39
- bh*, labial mute, ii 39, doubled in certain words, xiv 8
- Brāhmana-passages in the *Saṃhitā*, p 18
- c* palatal mute, ii 36, insertion of *ç* before, v 4, 5, *t* to *c* before, v 22, *n* to *ç* or *ñ* before, v 20, 21, 24
- ç*, palatal spirant, i 9, ii 14-5, initial to *ch* after any mute *ç* or *m*, v 34-7, *t* to *c* before, v 22, *n* to *ç* before, v 21, irregular insertions of v 1, 5, inserted after *n*, v 20-1
- ch*, palatal mute, ii 36, product of *ç* after a mute, v 34-7, *t* to *c* before v 22, *n* to *ñ* before, v 24, doubled in certain words, xiv 8
- Cerebral mutes, see Lingual
- Çikshā, quoted in the comment, p 435
- Circumflex accent (*śvara*), mode of utterance, i 40-7, degree of effort in, xvii 6, xx 9-12, kinds of independent circumflex, xv 1, 2, 4, 5, their occurrence, x 16, 17, xii 9, kinds of enclitic circumflex, xx 3, 6, 7, its occurrence, xiv 29-31, *kampa* between two circumflexes, xix 3-5, nature of enclitic circumflex, p 315
- Citation, rules of, i 22, 24, 50-3
- Citations in the comment not found in the Tāitṛīya-Saṃhitā, p 425-6
- Commentary, see Tribhāṣhyaratna
- Compound words, separable, count as two, i 48, first member called *avagraha*, i 49
- Consonants, i 6, their classification and description, i 7-14, ii 8-11 30, 33-52, names i 17-8, 21, quantity, i 34, 37, p 377, accent, i 43, belong to what vowel, xxi 1-9, relation of consonant and vowel, p 72, 375-7 see also the several letters and classes, and Groups
- d*, dental mute, ii 38, irregular insertion of, v 8
- d*, lingual mute, ii 37, product of alteration of *t*, xiii 16

- Dental mutes (*ṭ, ṭh, ḍ, ḍh, ṇ*), how formed, n 18 see also the several letters
- dh*, dental mute, n 18
- dh*, lingual mute, n 17
- Diphthongs (*e, ai, o, au*) see the several letters
- Duplication of *n, ṇ*, final, n 18-9, of *ch, kh, bh*, xiv 8 of aspirate mutes in the MSS, p 290, 294 duplication in consonant groups, xiv 1-7, 9-28
- e* how uttered, n 15-7, 23, combination with preceding *a, u*, v 6, with following vowel, ix 11, 13, x 19, initial *a* elided after, xi 1 etc., resulting accent, xii 9-11, final *a* elided before, v 14, *pragāḥa* ending, iv 8-54
- Eision, see Omission
- Euphonic alteration, concerns single element only, 156, of a cited word, does not suspend rules, i 51, mode of intoning in rules, i 23, 28
- Final consonant, belongs to preceding vowel, xxi 3, makes heavy syllable, xxii 14
- g* guttural mute, n 35
- gh*, guttural mute n 35
- Grammarians quoted by name in the rules and comment, p 430
- Grave accent (*anudatta*), defined, i 39, how produced, xxii 10, grave syllable, when converted to enclitic circumflex, xiv 29-31, when uttered at acute pitch, xxii 10-1
- Groups of consonants, occurring in Tāṭtriya-Saṁhitā, detail of their division in syllabication, p 380-2, 385 make a heavy syllable, xxii 14
- Guttural mutes (*k, kh, g, gh, ṇ*) how formed, n 35 see also the several letters
- h*, a spirant, i 9, not surd, i 13, intermedate between surd and sonant, i 6, mutes in sonant aspirates n 9, uttered in the throat, n 46, has same position as following vowel, n 47, combination with preceding final mute, v 38-41, before a nasal, *ndsukya* inserted after, xxi 14
- h*, see *visarjanīya*
- Heavy syllable, xxii 14
- i, ī* how formed, n 22, combination with preceding *a, ā*, x 4, with following vowel, x 15 resulting circumflex, v 16 —2, final, result of irregular prolongation, in 7, 13, *pragāḥa* ending, iv 8-54
- Increment, how intoned i 23
- Insertions, of *ṭ, s, ḍ* anomalous, v 4-8, of *k, ṭ*, v 32, 33, after spirant before mute, xiv 9
- j*, palatal mute, n 36, *t* before, to *j*, v 23, *n* before, to *ñ*, v 24
- ṛatā* text, p 429-30
- jh*, palatal mute, n 36, not found in the Saṁhitā, p 72
- jihvāmūlīya* (*χ*), guttural spirant, i 9, n 41-5, its designation i 18, occurrence, iv 2-4
- h*, guttural mute, n 35, inserted after *n* before *s, sh*, v 32, *h* to *s* or *sh* before, viii 23 etc.
- kampa*, peculiar affection of a circumflex followed by another circumflex, xix 3-5 differences between the Tāṭtriya and other texts as to its occurrence and treatment, p 362-3
- kandīkas*, division of *anuvāhas* into, not recognized by the Pratiçākhyā, p 5, 83, 427, 430
- Kārttikeya as-erted author of the Pratiçākhyā p 1
- kh*, guttural mute, n 35, *h* to *s* or *sh* before, viii 23 etc., doubled in certain words, xiv 8
- krama* text, p 429
- kshoṇṇa* circumflex, xx 1, its occurrence, v 16, its tone, xx 9
- l*, semivowel, i 8, how produced, n 42, assimilates preceding *t, m, n*, v 25, 26 28, resulting nasal *l*, v 26, 28, changed to *d*, xii 16, duplication after xiv 2, 3, 7
- l*, not a simple vowel, p 11, of short quantity i 31, how produced, n 18
- Labial mutes (*p, ph, b, bh, m*), how formed, n 39 see also the several letters
- Light syllable, xxii 15
- Lingual mutes (*ṭ, ṭh, ḍ, ḍh, ṇ*), how formed n 37 see also the several letters
- Long vowel, i 35 and see Prolongation
- m*, labial mute, n 39, assimilated to following mute, v 27 and semivowel (except *r*), v 28-31, xii 3, irregularly dropped, v 12, to *ñ* before *r* or spirant v 29, xii 2, unchanged before *rā*, xii. 4
- Manuscripts of Pratiçākhyā and commentary see Tāṭtriya-Pratiçākhyā
- Mutes, i 7, division and names, i 10, 11, what mutes are surd, i 12, mode of formation of the various series, n 35-9, their designation, i 27 see also the several series and letters

- n*, dental mute, ii 38, change of, to *ñ*, before palatals, v 24, 37, to nasal *l*, v 25-6, 31, to *ñ*, v 20, 21, to *ñ*, v 14, to *ñ* or *ñ* (through *y*), ix 20-4, to *n*, vii 1-12, 15, 16, xii 6-8, 13-5, physical ground of this change, p 281, adds *r* before *s*, *śh*, v 33, doubled ix 19
- n*, guttural mute, ii 35, adds *h* before *s*, *śh*, v 32, doubled, ix 18
- ñ*, palatal mute, ii 36, *n* changed to, v 24, 37
- n*, lingual mute, ii 37, *n* changed to, vii 1-12, 15, 16, xii 6-8, 13-5, detail of its occurrence when not result of euphonic causes, xiii 9-12
- ñ*, see *anusvāra*
- Nasal, what sounds are, ii 30, nasal quality how given, ii 52, its differences of degree, xvii 1-4 —nasal mutes surd mute to nasal before, vii 2, exception, vii 4, take a prefixed surd after a sibilant, xiv 9, take *yama* after preceding non nasal xvi 12, take *nāśikya* after preceding *h* xvi 11 see also the several letters —nasal semivowels, result of change of *m*, *n*, v 26, 28 —nasalized vowel, alternative for *ñ*, v 31, xv 1, result of combination, x 11, discussion of the doctrine of the treatise as to *ñ* or nasal vowel, p 67-70 nasalization of a final vowel, xv 6-8, its prolongation, xvii 5
- nāśikya*, or *yama*, xxi 12, nose-sound, inserted between *h* and nasal mute, xxi 14
- nūtya* circumflex, xx 2, its tone, xx 9
- Nose sounds (*yamas*, *nāśikya*), how produced, ii 49-51, how designated, i 18, occurrence, xxi 12-4, how treated in syllabication, xxi 8
- o*, diphthong, how produced, ii 13-4, when *pragāha*, iv 6, 7, combination with preceding *a*, *d*, x 7, with following vowel ix 12-3, x 19-23, final *a* elided before, x 14, *ah* changed to, before *a* and sonant consonant, ix 7, 8, initial *a* elided after, xi 1 etc
- om*, utterance of, xvii 1-7
- Omission (*lopa*), defined, i 57, how intimated, 223, affects single elements *r*, only i 56, cases of, irregular, v 11-19, omission of *h*, before spirant followed by surd, ix 1, before a vowel, ix 9, of *a* after *e* or *o*, xi 1 etc, nature of this omission, xi 19
- Organs of articulation, ii 3, their mode of action, ii 31-4 and see the several letters and classes
- p*, labial mute, ii 39, *h* to *śh* or *s* before, *s*, dental spirant, i 9, ii 44, irregular in sections of, v 6, 7 omission, v 14, *pada* text, peculiarities of, in Taittiriya Saṁhitā, p 57, 98-9 169 note, 128-9
- padavṛtta* enclitic circumflex xx 6, its tone, xx 12
- Palatal mutes (*c*, *ch*, *j*, *ñ*) ii 36 see also the several letters
- Panini, cited in commentaries p 135
- Pauses, quantity of, xvii 13
- ph*, labial mute, ii 39
- phata*, see Protracted
- prāya* accent, xxi 10-1 of *om*, xvii 1, *vikrama* after, xix 2
- prāśiṣṭa* circumflex xx 5 its occurrence x 17, tone, xx 11
- pragāha* final, detail of ix 1-54, are uncombinable, x 24, rarely elide *a*, p 264
- Pratiśākhyā, see Taittiriya
- pratihata* enclitic circumflex xx 3, its tone xx 11, discussion of its true character, p 369-70
- Prepositions list of i 15 *a* of preposition combines with *r* to *ar* x 9, usually take *ih* in *pada* text, p 229, 428
- Prolongation, irregular, of vowels in *saṁhita* in 1-15, of vowel after loss of final *r* viii 17, of nasalized vowel xvii 5, of circumflex vowel taking *kampa*, p 362-3
- Protracted (*phata*) vowel quantity of, i 36, uncombinable, x 24, detail of cases occurring in Saṁhitā, p 323-4, a vowel following, is not styled "similar," i 4, nasalization of, when final, xv 78, tone of (?), xv 9
- Qualifications of a scholar and teacher, xxiv 5, 6
- Qualities (*sthāna*) of sound xxii 11, xxiii 4-10
- Quantity, see Analysis, p 137
- r*, semivowel, i 8, how uttered, ii 41, its name, i 19, takes *vanabhakti* before a spiritant, xxi 15, *h* converted into, v 10 vii 6-15, but lost before *r*, and preceding vowel lengthened, vii 16-7 *n* converted into, ix 20-4, causes duplication xiv 4, 6, changes following *n* to *n*, xii 6, *m* to *ñ* before, xii 2, xv 1-3 *r* not simple vowels, p 11, their composition, p 792, how uttered, ii 18, change following *n* to *n*, xii 6 etc quantity of *r*, i 31, combination with preceding *a*, *d*, x 8, 9, anomalous conversion to *ar*, v 9
- Repeated passages treatment of, i 61
- Repetition of compound words, with *ih*, in *pada* text, p 85
- ś*, labial mute, ii 39, *h* to *śh* or *s* before, *s*, dental spirant, i 9, ii 44, irregular in sections of, v 6, 7 omission, v 14, *p*, labial mute, ii 39, *h* to *śh* or *s* before, *s*, dental spirant, i 9, ii 44, irregular in sections of, v 6, 7 omission, v 14,

- conversion to *sh*, v 10, vi 1-13, inserted after *n* before *t*, vi 14, insertions of *k* and *t* before, v 1-32, *s* from *h* before *k*, *kh*, *p*, viii 23-35
- Schools of Vedic study cited by name, p 427
- Semivowels (*y*, *i*, *u*, *v*), 18, their effect on division of syllables, xxi 7 and see the several letters
- sh*, lingual spirant, i 9, ii 44, conversion of *s* to, v 10, vi 1-13, insertions of *k* and *t* before, v 32-3, changes following *t*, *th*, to *t*, *th*, viii 13-4, *n* to *n*, xiii 6 etc., *sh* from *h* before *k*, *kh*, *p*, viii 23-35
- Short vowels, i 31-3
- Sibilants (*ś*, *sh*, *s*), see the several letters, and Spirants
- Similar vowels, i 34
- Sonant utterance, ii 4, sonant consonants, i 14
- Spirants (*ç*, *ś*, *śh*, *s*, *phi*, *h*), 19, quality as regards sonancy, i 12-3, require more breath, i 13, mode of articulation, ii 44-5, converted into, ix 2-6, insertion after, before mute, xiv 9-11, aspiration of a surd mute before, xiv 12-3, effect of, on division of syllables, xxi 9 see also the several letters
- Surd mute, converted to sonant before sonant, viii 3, to nasal before nasal, viii 24
- Surd utterance, ii 5, 10, surd consonants, i 12
- svarabhakti*, how uttered, ii 19, occurrence, xxi 15-6, belongs to what syllable, xxi 8, various kinds of, p 392-3
- svarita*, see Circumflex
- Syllable-son, xxi 1-14
- Syllables, heavy and light, xxii 14-5
- ṭ*, dental mute, ii 38, changed to *c* or *ç* before palatals, v 22, 23, to *l* before *l*, *ṭ* becomes *ts* before, vi 14, in *ṭṭ* after *t*, *ṣ*, before *s*, *sh*, v 33, changed to *t* after *sh*, viii 13
- t*, lingual mute, ii 37, adds *t* before *s*, *sh*, v 33, *t* changed to, after *sh*, viii 13
- tāvovayāna* enclitic circumflex, xv 7, its tone, xi 12
- Taittiriya Āraṇyaka, phrases quoted from, in commentary, p 425-6
- Taittiriya Brāhmaṇa, phrases quoted from, in commentary, p 425-6
- Taittiriya Prātiśākhya, manuscripts of, p 1-3, various readings in its text, see Additions and Corrections, p 467, its commentary, see Tribhāshyaratna, right to its name, p 427, relation of the text it implies to the known Taittiriya-Saṁhitā, p 424-8, grammarians quoted by it, p 430, classification of their quoted doctrines p 430-2, presumable alterations in it, p 432, its character, p 432-3
- Taittiriya Saṁhitā, relation of, to the text assumed in the Prātiśākhya, p 424-7, its divisions, p 430, names of different parts of, p 430
- Text, four kinds of, xxiv 1-4, various forms of, assumed by the Prātiśākhya p 428-30
- th*, dental mute, ii 38, changed to *th* after *sh*, viii 14
- th*, lingual mute, ii 37, *th* changed to, after *sh*, viii 14
- Tones (*yama*), the twenty one xxvii 12, xxviii 11 etc., tone of *om*, xviii 4
- Tribhāshyaratna, manuscripts of, p 1-3, different versions, p 3, its sources, and meaning of its name, p 6-7, works quoted in it, p 435, its relation to and treatment of the Prātiśākhya, 433-4, quotation of phrases not found in the Saṁhitā, 424 6
- u*, *ū* how formed, ii 24-5, combination with preceding *a*, *u*, x 5 — combination of *u* with following vowel, x 15, resulting circumflex, x 16 — *u*, *pragraha* as final, iv 5, result of irregular prolongation, iii 7, 14, occurrence of *pramāṣṭa* circumflex in x 17
- u*, particle, combination of, ix 16-7, finals combined with, p 102-4
- udatta*, see Acute
- Un combinable final vowels, x 13, 18, 24, 25
- upadhmānrya* (*phi*), labial spirant, i 9, ii 44-5, its designation, i 18, occurrence ix 2-4
- Upāṅgas, enumerated, p 422
- v*, semivowel, 18, how uttered, ii 43, irregular omission of, as initial, v 13, final, dropped, x 19-23, nasal *v* from *m*, v 28, 30, duplication after, xiv 2, resolution of usual *v* into *uv*, p 64
- Vājasaneyi-Brahmana, referred to in commentary, p 317
- varṇakrama*, see Duplication
- Veda rewards promised for studying or teaching, p 420-1 see also Yajurveda
- Taittiriya Saṁhitā
- Vedāṅgas, enumerated, p 422
- vikrama* accent, xix 1, 2, its tone, xvii 6
- visarjanrya* (*h*), not a spirant, p 14, how uttered, ii 46, 48, is surd, i 12, its designation, i 16, authorized in *saṁhitā* only before pause and *ksh*, ix 3, becomes spirant before surd ix 2, dropped before spirant followed by surd ix 1, to *s* or *sh*, before *k*, *kh*, *p*, viii 23-35 to *sh* before *t* xi 5, omitted in *saṁhitā* etc., v 15-7, to *r* (except before *r*), viii

ADDITIONS AND CORRECTIONS

PART of these emendations are due to Prof. Weber, who has called my attention to them in private communications. A few slight misprints, of obvious character, are not noted here.

p 2, l 25 The MS used by Weber was another (No 504) in the same collection containing only the text (incomplete) of the *Pratīcākhya*.

p 3, l 1 Dr. Rosi's description of these MSSs has not yet appeared. It appears, however, that the rules of the *Pratīcākhya* are read interspersed in the commentary also, as well as prefixed to it in a body (with separate paging).

p 3, l 4 The differences of reading in the *Pratīcākhya* text itself are more numerous than is here stated. They have been pointed out in the course of the work (either in the notes on the rules, or in the various readings to the comment)—namely, as occurring (with here and there an addition, omitted in its proper place) in i 61, ii 17, 51, iv 11, 39 (T W *ahne* for 'hne) v 13, 20 (G M *akana*, for *ram*—a mere blunder), vii 8 (G M *yayush*, for *yayuh*), 12, viii 8 (T, it should be added, has dropped both *sanuta* and *stanuta*), 13, 35, ix 21, 22 x 11 (T W B O *anunavikam*, for 'nun), 13 (G M *pa asiparo budhmya jyu a pusha amnanta arshe*, which is perhaps the more acceptable reading, since it gives the uncombinable finals their uncombable quality in the rule also), 22, xi 16 (G M *adabdhasa* and *ashadhah*, with unelided *a*), 17 (G M *ahmyā mā mbah*), 18, 19 (G M repeat the whole rule, instead of its last two words only) xii 4, 9 (T O *asman*, for *tas*), xiii 4, 13, 14 (see farther on), 15, xiv 3, 8 (G M *upasarga ca patha*—a blunder only), 13, 32, xvi 1, 5 (G M *ganstan unani*—a blunder), 7, 13 (G M omit *pripiva* in the rule, as well as its example in the comment, but they give the word in the rehearsal at the beginning of the comment) 16, 19, 22 26, xvii 2, 4, xviii 1 (T *svaritay ca pl*), ix 9 (G M substitute in the text MS rule xvii 6, except the word *puushkan asadeh*), xxi 5, 6, 14, xxii 7 (W O also have *shakah* in the rule, but not in the comment), xxiii 2, 6, 10, 12, 14, 20, xxiv 4. The reading adopted for rule xiii 14 is that of T G M (save that T has *shtha* for *shna*, and *rāvinna*, with *vinama* under the *v*, and G M have *ravinna* in the text-MSS, and *rāvinna* in the MSS with comment), W gives *raṇ shan shita mna ravn* (with *vrāma* under both *v* and *n*), for () the collator has noted nothing, B reads *ra shan shna mna ravn givna*. Other evident copyists' errors occur, of too little account to be worth notice.

A reading has been adopted contrary to the authority of all the MSSs at ix 1, 20 (where the MSSs reading is *ikān aūkdrap*), xi 1, 17. The writing of *ingya* for *ingya* was noted under i 48.

p 9, l 16 The commentator, as will be seen under xxi 14, interprets out of existence the *nāsikhya* as an independent element.

p 11, l 7 The structure of *v* is defined by the commentator under xxi 15.

p 18, l 12 The commentator refers to some "different reading" (perhaps in his *Śikshā*? there is no trace of it in the *Pratīcākhya*), beginning *pra para pa sam*, but declares it to have to do only with the addition to all these words of *ti* (in the *padā* text, namely, which writes *e ti* for *i*, *ape ti* for *apa*, and so on) and not to their receiving the name *upasarga*. I still fail to see any reason for this limitation of the class to half its usual number.

p 23, l 13 Delete the hyphen at the end of the line.

p 33, l 16 One may conjecture that rule 43 formerly concluded the treatment of accent in this chapter, and applied to all the three kinds of accent, but, rules 44–7, on the circumflex, being later interpolated, the connection made it necessary to understand this also as applying to the circumflex alone.

p 34, rule 46 The same example (from iii 111) is quoted by the comment under this rule as under rules 43 and 47.

p 37, l 19 Compare under rules xvi 26, 29, where this claim is distinctly made. But it is not entirely well founded, for there are cases where combinations of sounds which are *padas* are quoted as *padarūpadeśas*—thus *han* in vii 11, *pa* in xvi 2, *h* in xvi 13, etc.

- p 42, ll 28,32,43, read iv 23 (for iv 25)
- p 46, l 3 Read (in part of the edition) *alteration* for *nasalization*
- p 82, last line Restore (in part of the edition) the lost figure 6 before *na*, at the beginning of the line
- p 83, l 2 The passage is found at iv 151
- p 87, rule 5 For *aqhā*, in rule and translation read *adya*, and the example on the next page, is *adyavād* (p *adya* *vād*) The St Petersburg lexicon (in the Appendix) has this word in its proper form, but I unfortunately overlooked it
- p 88, l 28, and p 99, l 5 No division is made of *prāṇa* in *pada* text
- p 96, l 28 Read *kāh* for *kāḥ* (in part of the edition)
- p 101, l 20 I have little or no doubt that the interpretation here suggested is the true one
- p 103, l 7 from below *To* is not an independent word see the St Petersburg lexicon, s v *totaḥ*
- p 104, l 24 So far as the vocatives in *o* are concerned the existing *pada* text appears to accord with the Praticakhyā we have them with *iti* as *prāṇāḥ*, for example, at i 381,147, 427, and without *iti* at i 2132 439 But *o uta, upa*, and *pro* are followed by *iti* wherever they occur (for to see the preceding correction), although this is not authorized by the Praticakhyā
- p 110, l 32 The *pada* text divides *dyāva prthivī*
- p 121, ll 23,24 Read (in part of the edition) *andragrā* and *indragrā*
- p 123, l 18 Insert the omitted example *hīma vata vidathe antaḥ csham* (u 111)
- p 124, l 12 Read (in part of the edition) *patam* for *patam*
- p 132, l 15 But note the case reported under 159 (p 43)
- p 138, l 13 Read (in part of the edition) *nra* (for *nra*)
- p 153, l 27 I have omitted part of the passages in which *t* occurs before *sh*, namely vi 6111,2 vii 287 It should have been added, too, that the Saṁhitā furnishes no example of *n* before *sh*
- p 157, l 23 The citation is from vi 331, as under the two preceding rules
- p 160, l 24 This is not correct, so far as the existing *pada* text is concerned I was not aware at the time of writing the note that that text treated the *anagraha* pause as suspending the continuance of accentual influence (see p 369, first marginal note) The application of the rule, however, is as stated, compound words having been already provided for by rule 2
- p 167, l 14 The peculiarity of accentuation referred to in the preceding correction would allow of these examples being brought under rule 4
- p 173, l 20 Read *parāṇutyā*
- p 176, rule 11, translation Read *human*
- p 179, l 12 The suggestion of *gnaruketi* here is not well founded, the sphere of action of the rules in this and in the thirteenth chapter being different
- p 183, l 10 *dhvātrāḥ pāṇāḥ* is found in Tāltt Āraṇyaka, at iii 132
- p 193, ll 9,10 References should have been given for the words *ahorātrāḥ bhayā* and *ahorātrayoh*, the former is found at ii 173 et al, the latter at vi 131 *dhvāshavane* occurs only at vi 214
- p 194, l 14 The reference for *rūmo antaḥ* is iv 1104 5 et al
- p 199, l 9 from below The *pada* text leaves *bhrāspati* undivided, so that the combination does not come within the ken of the treatise at all
- p 199, l 13 from below Read (in part of the edition) ll 157 for ll 157
- p 205, l 14 The omission of *h* before a spirant followed by a sonant consonant, here referred to as a doctrine held in schools of the Black Yajus, is practised in the manuscripts of our treatise and its commentary to a degree far beyond what can be regarded as merely accidental Q M observe it almost without exception, and it prevails also in the others
- p 209, rule 7 Doubtless *ahārto* is to be understood here as an adjective, qualifying *vīcīṣṇya* understood, 'h completed to *ah*' as the comment clearly intends. This also removes the difficulty of *anuvṛti* spoken of on pp. 210-11, so far as the implication of *vīcīṣṇya* is concerned
- p 215, l 3 Read *is* for *does*
- p 218, l 5 The example *parum* etc occurs first at i 521.
- p 222, l 13 Read (in part of the edition) 'one *vīmān* (for *-mān*),'
- p 224, l 4 Read *Also* for *Nor*

- p 232, l 26 I have noted here all the cases in which the *samhitā* text shows *dha*, *ma*, or *pa* before *asi*, it appears, however, from Weber's edition of the *Sanhitā*, that a part of them have *h* in *pada* text after the *a* *
- p 233, l 11 from below Read (in part of the edition) *pi ape 've* (for *pa*)
- p 239, l 6 Read *o* for *a*
- p 265, l 5 The combination *u dhvo asthat* is in fact read first *it iv 2 14*, in an *ukhya* passage
- p 265, l 10 There is, however a case in which *a* is omitted according to the general rules, when by the letter, though not the spirit of 161 it ought to be retained, see under 161 (p 47)
- p 273, rule 12 I should doubtless have done better to adopt the reading *ī amīyā* (for *ban*), in rule, version, and example
- p 291, l 24 *Achavakah* is found at vii 1 55
- p 296, l 9 Read *hishn* (by ix 3), and this would change the treatment of the group, since *h* (ix 3) is not a spirant
- p 301, l 3 Read *hishn*, *hishn*, *hishv* (by ix 3), so that *nhvumulya* occurs only in the four remaining groups
- p 302, l 23 I can give no reference for *varshubhyah*, the reading at vii 4 13 being *varshyabhyah svaha 'varshyabhyah*
- p 303, l 9 I was heedless enough here to overlook the fact that a spirant never stands, according to the rules of this chapter, before either in aspirated surd or a nasal, since a first mute (by rule 9, above) is always inserted in such cases between the two. The groups *ch* etc. therefore, would be read according to this rule *chch*, instead of *chch*. The groups in which a nasal originally follows the spirant will be found catalogued under rule xxi 12 (p 390). The example *tasmad* etc., below, is therefore no counter example, and it is G. M. that are in the wrong in so calling it, it is to be read *taspmat*, according to Plakshi etc., instead of *tasspmat* (or, with *yanna*, *tassppmat*)
- p 304, l 5 See also under xxi 16
- p 308, l 6 from below Read *dhakare* for *ia*
- p 315, l 10 Prof Hadley's paper may be found printed in full in the Transactions of the American Philological Association (vol 1, 1871, p 1 ff)
- p 334, l 7 Read vii 5 152 (for vii 5 142)
- p 336, l 7 "Verbal forms"—that is, of course, all excepting *rishi*
- p 354, ll 17, 25 See p 426 Prof Roth's MS also ends with *samudrah*, he calls my attention, further, to the passage in the Brhad Āranyaka (i 1 2) *samudra eva 'sya* [i e *apvasya*] *bandhuh samudro yonih*
- p 356, l 3 For *dhṛta* as synonym of *pracaya*, see below, under xxii 17 (p 412)
- p 364, l 24 And accordant, it may be added, with the practice followed in the Vājasaneyi Sanhitā, where there is no added figure, and no prolongation of the vowel
- p 369, marg notes, l 6 The *anudatta* mark under *su* (the second time) has fallen out
- p 373, l 1 Read 12 51 (for 12 52)
- p 386, l 18 The *e* sign has broken off in the *samhitā*-reading of *agne*
- p 387, l 7 I have considered this point more fully in a paper of the Sanskrit accent in the Transactions of the Am. Philological Association (vol 1, 1871, p 20 ff)
- p 414, l 4 Read (in Devanāgarī) *kramavak*, for *kramavak*- (altered in the type, by some mishap, after the last correction).
- p 425, l 29-30 *Achavakah* is found at vii 1 55
- p 428, l 37 But see, for the commentary, the additional note above to 115 (on p. 18)
- p 429, l 26 The *krama*-text is also quoted under ix 24 (p 224) by O. alone
- p 438, last line but one Read xvi for xxvi